

A STUDY OF THE TEACHING METHODS, MATERIALS, CLASS
ORGANIZATIONS, AND OPINIONS OF AMERICAN
HISTORY TEACHERS IN SELECTED IOWA
HIGH SCHOOLS

An abstract of a dissertation by
Stuart Bintner
August, 1978
Drake University
Advisor: Charles D. Rowley

The problem. The purpose of the study was to examine the present status of social studies education in selected Iowa public high schools. The research particularly focused on aspects of social studies education related to the "new social studies" movement. The study concentrated on American History classes, since they provided a common base for research.

Procedure. Teachers in thirty-five randomly selected Iowa public high schools received a questionnaire-opinionnaire form which they were asked to complete and return. The form elicited responses regarding the teachers' teaching methods, materials, and class organizations. The teachers also responded to questions intended to determine their attitudes toward new social studies techniques and concepts.

The respondents' answers were categorized according to the degree to which the teaching methods, materials, and class organizations reflected traditional or new social studies orientations. Teachers' opinions toward new social studies approaches and concepts were also analyzed.

Finally, it was determined if any statistically significant relationships existed between the use of new social studies teaching methods, materials, and class organizations and three selected variables. The variables were: (1) years of teacher experience, (2) number of class preparations, and (3) educational exposure of the teacher to the new social studies. It was also determined if a significant relationship existed between opinions about new social studies approaches and the three variables.

Findings. Analysis of the respondents' answers showed that nearly 64 percent of the teachers reported using teaching methods that reflected a combination of traditional and new social studies approaches. Nearly 31 percent indicated that they taught in a traditional manner, and the remaining 4 percent showed a considerable use of new social studies approaches. Fifty-six percent of the respondents indicated that they used materials that were judged to be an eclectic combination of traditional and innovative. Thirty-five percent used traditional

materials, while the remaining 9 percent used materials that strongly reflected a new social studies approach. Sixty-six percent of the respondents reported using ideas and concepts from social science disciplines, while 34 percent indicated that they did not. Twenty-one percent of the respondents gave opinions that strongly favored approaches that combined traditional and innovative methods. There was no significant relationship between teaching methods, materials, class organizations, or teacher opinions and any of the three variables--with one exception. Teachers with more than seven years experience showed more favorable attitudes toward new social studies approaches than did teachers with seven or fewer years.

Conclusions. The findings indicated the following conclusions: (1) The majority of teachers reported using teaching methods, materials, and class organizations that reflect a combination of traditional and new social studies approaches; (2) The majority of teachers gave opinions that favored using a combination of traditional and new social studies methods; (3) On the whole, teachers' opinions were more favorable toward new social studies approaches than their teaching methods, materials, or class organizations would indicate; (4) Teachers with more than seven years of experience were more likely to have favorable opinions about new social studies practices than were those with less experience.

Recommendations. Recommendations included: (1) It is desirable that further study be made of the teaching methods used by social studies teachers; (2) Another area for investigation involves the possible relationship between approaches used by social studies teachers and the college or university at which they were trained; (3) Further research could be aimed at examination of the finding that teachers with over seven years experience tended to show more favorable opinions about innovative approaches to teaching social studies.

A STUDY OF THE TEACHING METHODS, MATERIALS, CLASS
ORGANIZATIONS, AND OPINIONS OF AMERICAN
HISTORY TEACHERS IN SELECTED IOWA
HIGH SCHOOLS

A Dissertation
Presented to
The School of Graduate Studies
Drake University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

by
Stuart Bintner
August, 1978

A STUDY OF THE TEACHING METHODS, MATERIALS, CLASS
ORGANIZATIONS, AND OPINIONS OF AMERICAN
HISTORY TEACHERS IN SELECTED IOWA
HIGH SCHOOLS

by

Stuart Bintner

Approved by Committee:

Charles D. Rowley
Chairman

Robert L. Evans
Co-Chairman

W. Russell Abell

Lewis J. McQuillen

Robert Allen Brannon

Earl L. Canfield
Dean of the School of Graduate Studies

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vii
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
PROBLEM	3
PURPOSE	4
METHODOLOGY	4
HYPOTHESIS	9
SIGNIFICANCE	11
ASSUMPTIONS	14
DEFINITIONS	14
LIMITATIONS	15
2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	16
APPROACHES TO SOCIAL STUDIES EDUCATION	16
DEVELOPMENT OF THE NEW SOCIAL STUDIES	24
CHARACTERISTICS OF THE NEW SOCIAL STUDIES	26
CRITICS OF THE NEW SOCIAL STUDIES	37
PRESENT STATUS OF THE NEW SOCIAL STUDIES	44
3. METHODS AND PROCEDURES	50
4. FINDINGS	62
5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	90
CONCLUSIONS	92
RECOMMENDATIONS	100

BIBLIOGRAPHY	104
------------------------	-----

APPENDIXES

A. LETTERS TO PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS	109
B. LIST OF SCHOOLS AND THE NUMBER OF REPLIES FROM EACH	112
C. QUESTIONNAIRE-OPINIONNAIRE	114
D. TEXTBOOKS USED BY RESPONDENTS	116

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Number and Percentage of Respondents in Categories One, Two and Three Relative to Methods	64
2. Number and Percentage of Respondents in Categories One, Two and Three Relative to Materials	65
3. Number and Percentage of Respondents Using and Not Using Interdisciplinary Approaches	66
4. Number and Percentage of Respondents in Categories One, Two and Three Relative to Attitudes Toward New Social Studies	67
5. Analysis of Relationship Between Years of Experience and Teaching Methods	69
6. Analysis of the Relationship Between Years of Experience and Teaching Materials	70
7. Analysis of the Relationship Between Years of Experience and Class Organizations	71
8. Analysis of the Relationship Between Years of Experience and Teachers' Opinions	74
9. Analysis of the Relationship Between Years of Experience and Teacher Opinions Using Yates' Correction	75
10. Analysis of the Relationship Between Number of Class Preparations and Teaching Methods	77
11. Analysis of the Relationship Between Number of Class Preparations and Teaching Methods in a 2 x 2 Configuration	78

Table		Page
12.	Analysis of the Relationship Between Number of Class Preparations and Teaching Materials	79
13.	Analysis of the Relationship Between Number of Class Preparations and Class Organizations	80
14.	Analysis of the Relationship Between Number of Class Preparations and Teacher Opinions	81
15.	Analysis of the Relationship Between Educational Exposure to the New Social Studies and Teaching Methods	83
16.	Analysis of the Relationship Between Educational Exposure to the New Social Studies and Teaching Materials	84
17.	Analysis of the Relationship Between Educational Exposure to the New Social Studies and Class Organizations	85
18.	Analysis of the Relationship Between Educational Exposure to the New Social Studies and Teacher Opinions	86

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Since the early 1960's professional educators have advocated the increased use of an inquiry approach in teaching American History and other social studies classes. This renewed emphasis on inquiry was an important thrust in what was referred to as the "new social studies" and is now considered conventional wisdom by many. There is doubt, however, regarding the extent to which teachers at the classroom level have actually accepted a more extensive use of the inquiry method. The purpose of this study is to help determine the actual impact of the new social studies movement on selected American History teachers in Iowa public schools.

The new social studies movement developed in a somewhat fragmentary manner. Because of the uncoordinated development, it is difficult to authoritatively quantify distinguishing characteristics. While unanimity has not been reached in regard to desirable features of curricula, there are several factors upon which many writers agree: (1) the importance of developing an awareness of processes and problem solving structures based on social science models, (2) the need to use inductive or inquiry approaches and to de-emphasize rote memory as an end in

itself, (3) the need to emphasize conceptual development, (4) the use of interdisciplinary approaches, and (5) the desirability of multi-material approaches and materials designed for inquiry. Although these characteristics are not always easily separated from each other, they can be examined individually.

This strong emphasis on inquiry and conceptualization has not always been present. Although the modern stress on inductive learning dates back at least as far as the writings of John Dewey, content-centered goals have often been considered more important. In the late 1880's the "traditional" instructional model emphasized teaching history for its own sake. Later the goal became understanding American society. Other goals--citizenship skills, for example--have been stressed at various times.¹ On the whole, the traditional position has held that factual cognitive knowledge, of and by itself, is the major goal of social studies education. Textbook authors and teachers who follow the traditional model have usually emphasized a narrative approach to teaching history. According to this view, history at the secondary school level is presented as an account of what happened in the past. The facts to be considered and the conclusions to be drawn are usually provided by the teacher, the textbook or both.

¹Robert Dale Barr, "The Changing Role of History in the American Public Schools," Dissertation Abstracts International, 30 (1970), 4670A (Purdue University).

PROBLEM

The new social studies movement is no longer "new." Materials have generally been available from publishers since the late 1960's, and, for the most part, the ideals and goals of the new social studies are generally accepted by most writers in education and by curriculum experts. Some important questions still remain. To what extent do classroom teachers actually use the innovative practices? Under what circumstances do teachers accept or reject the new social studies? How do teachers feel about the new programs and the renewed emphasis on inquiry?

These questions remain, for the most part, unanswered; although a few writers have addressed themselves to the problems involved. Walsh, for example, in a study of receptivity of teachers to innovation, concluded that dogmatism, sex and years of teaching experience were not significantly related to the degree of implementation of an innovative social studies curriculum at the elementary level.¹ Newton and Gerlach have both concluded that, despite the apparent

¹Thomas Michael Walsh, "The Relationship Between the Open-Closed Mindedness Systems Within Teachers and the Degree of Their Implementation of an Innovative Curriculum Program," Dissertation Abstracts International, 32 (1972), 4336 A (University of Minnesota).

ferment, few changes have taken place in most classrooms.¹ On the other hand, Harris and Mings found that teachers are gradually moving in the direction of new social studies ideals.²

PURPOSE

The purpose of this study was to provide additional knowledge regarding the present status of social studies education in Iowa public high schools. The research concentrated particularly on aspects of social studies education that were related to the new social studies movement. American History classes, since they provided a common base for study, were the focus of the research.

METHODOLOGY

The research presented concentrated on answering the following specific questions:

1. To what extent are "new social studies" methods, materials, and organizations used by American History teachers in selected public high schools in Iowa?

¹Richard F. Newton, "What's New About the New Social Studies?" The Social Studies, 63 (April, 1972), 159; Ronald A. Gerlach, "Educational Objectives and the New Social Studies," School and Society, 99 (March, 1971), 181.

²Thomas C. Harris and Larry E. Mings, "The Revolution in American History," Curriculum Report (of the National Association of Secondary School Principals), 5 (April, 1976), 1-12.

2. What opinions do teachers of American History in selected public high schools in Iowa hold toward new social studies techniques and concepts?

3. Is there a relationship (a) between selected variables and the use of new social studies methods, materials, and organizations; is there a relationship (b) between the variables and teacher opinions regarding the new social studies methods materials and organizations? The variables are:

- (A) years of teacher experience
- (B) number of class preparations
- (C) educational exposure of the teacher to the new social studies--attendance at workshops or classes on the new social studies

A stratified random selection of thirty-five Iowa public high schools comprised the sample. The questionnaire-opinionnaires were sent to the principals of the selected schools together with an explanatory cover letter. The principals were, in turn, asked to refer the forms to all American History teachers on the staff. This method of sending the forms was selected because the names of the principals were available in the Iowa Educational Directory. Thus, a personal letter was sent directly to an individual. The personal aspect was stressed in an attempt to secure a high response rate. A stamped, self-addressed envelope was sent along with the cover letter and the question forms.

Larger schools received additional forms and envelopes.

Follow-up procedures were initiated when no response was received from a school. Principals received a second letter and additional forms and envelopes. A third letter was sent directly to the "American History Teacher" if the second letter also received no response.

The population for the study included all American History teachers in Iowa public high schools. To lessen the chance of selection bias the sample was stratified according to school size. One group included schools with fewer than 300 students in grades ten, eleven, and twelve. The second group had enrollments of between 300 and 599. The third group of schools had over 600 tenth, eleventh, and twelveth graders.

The questionnaire-opinionnaire sent to the schools included three sections intended to secure data which would help answer the questions previously stated. The first section contained questions concerning the nature of teaching materials used by the teacher. Also included were questions regarding years of teaching experience, number of class preparations, and training in inquiry or new social studies concepts. The second section concerned teaching methods or approaches to teaching used by the teacher. The third section was a Likert-type opinionnaire in which the respondent registered opinions regarding traditional and new social studies ideas and teaching techniques.

The answers from the three sections of the questionnaire-opinionnaire were scored in a similar manner. Respondent's answers were classified and placed into one of three categories. Category One was comprised of materials, teaching methods, and opinions that are traditional and deductive in approach. Category Two included materials, teaching methods and opinions that are a mixture of traditional and "new" or innovative. Category Three included materials, teaching methods, and opinions that reflect new social studies concepts to a high degree.

The data produced were analyzed to provide answers to the questions stated:

1. To what extent are "new social studies" methods, materials, and organizations used by American History teachers in selected public high schools in Iowa? This question was descriptively answered by a raw-score count which was also converted into percentages. The number and percentage of teachers falling into each of the three categories was calculated and recorded.

2. What opinions do teachers of American History in selected public high schools in Iowa hold toward new social studies techniques and concepts? Again, a descriptive determination of raw scores and percentages was used, and teachers' opinions fell into one of the three categories.

3. Is there a relationship (a) between selected variables and the use of new social studies methods, materials, and organizations; is there a relationship (b) between the variables and teacher opinions regarding the new social studies methods materials and organizations? The variables are: (A) years of teacher experience, (B) number of class preparations, and (C) educational exposure of the teacher to the new social studies--attendance at workshops or classes on the new social studies.

To analyze the information and answer this question the data was divided according to the selected variable being considered. For the first variable, years of teacher experience, one group consisted of teachers with one to three years experience. The second group included those with four through seven years experience. Those with more than seven years experience formed the third group. Chi-square analysis was then used to statistically determine if a significant difference existed between the groups in regard to methods, materials, organization and opinions about new social studies concepts. For example, the number of teachers with more than seven years experience and falling into "category three" in regard to teaching methods was determined from the data. Chi-square method of analysis was used to determine if the observed differences were greater than those which could be accounted for by chance. The same procedure

was used for categories one and two and for teachers with fewer than four years experience and for teachers with from four to seven years experience. The same technique was applied to the data concerning materials, class organization, and teacher opinions.

The second variable, number of class preparations, was examined because of its relationship to the amount of time that a teacher has to prepare materials or lessons for any particular class. The groupings selected were: (1) teachers with one preparation, (2) teachers with two preparations, and (3) teachers with three or more preparations. The statistical treatment was similar to that used for the first variable.

Groupings were also established in regard to whether or not the teacher had participated in classes or workshops stressing new social studies ideas and/or practices. The groupings were: (1) those who have participated in classes or workshops and (2) those who have not participated in classes or workshops. Again, chi-square analysis was used to determine if any significant differences existed in relation to methods, materials, class organization, and teacher opinion about new social studies concepts.

HYPOTHESES

In examining the stated problem and answering the questions previously outlined, the following methods

were used. Descriptive analysis (raw scores and percentages) was used to show the extent to which the selected teachers used new social studies methods, materials, and organizations. A descriptive analysis (raw scores and percentages) was also used to show the opinions held by selected teachers toward new social studies techniques and concepts.

The study also examined the relationship between selected variables and teaching methods, materials, class organizations, and teacher opinions about the new social studies. The variables are: (A) years of teacher experience, (B) number of class preparations, and (C) educational exposure of the teacher to the new social studies--attendance at workshops or classes on the new social studies.

A null hypothesis was tested for each of the variables examined. The null hypothesis for the first variable, years of teacher experience, was stated as follows: (1) There is no significant difference among the respondents in the three experience groups (those with one through three years, those with four through seven years, and those with over seven years) in relation to methods, materials, organizations, and opinions about new social studies ideals. The null hypothesis for the second variable, number of class preparations, was stated: (2) There is no significant difference among the respondents in the three preparation groups (those

with one preparation, those with two preparations, and those with three or more preparations) in relation to methods, materials, class organizations, and opinions about new social studies ideals. The null hypothesis for the third variable, educational exposure to the new social studies, was stated: (3) There is no significant difference between the respondents in the two groups (those who have participated in classes or workshops, and those who have not participated in classes or workshops) in relation to methods, materials, class organizations, and opinions about new social studies ideals.

SIGNIFICANCE

This study examined some important questions and considerations surrounding current practices in social studies education. Educators want and need to be aware of present practices at the classroom level. Educational leaders should be particularly interested in the nature of curricular and instructional practices that are commonly in use.

Those interested in the new social studies movement and the "national curriculum projects" of the past dozen years should find this research useful when assessing the effectiveness of these projects. During the last half of the 1960's and the early 1970's, government and private funds were used to develop curricular designs and materials through so-called

"national social studies projects." Scholars in subject-matter areas and educational specialists worked together to produce textual and multimedia materials aimed at encouraging innovative, inquiry-oriented, and inductive approaches to teaching social studies. The work of several projects became major ingredients in materials published by textbook and media companies. In fact, some projects were published with few, if any, basic changes by publishers.¹

What is the long-term impact of the national projects? Are the materials that were developed in common use? Are classroom teachers putting into practice the curricular and instructional concepts that these projects encouraged? The research detailed here is not expected to definitely answer these questions, however, the results should provide important clues and insights.

During the same period of time that the national curriculum projects flourished, colleges and universities throughout the United States offered classes and workshops aimed at fostering the new social studies materials and

¹A discussion of national curriculum projects and of many published materials that resulted from them may be found in an article entitled "A Critical Appraisal of Twenty-Six National Social Studies Projects" which was written by Norris N. Sanders and Marlin Tanck and published in the April, 1970 (Vol. 34, pp. 383-449) issue of Social Education.

practices. Some schools acted in response to the general ferment in social studies education. Others were also encouraged by the incentive of federal government funds. For example, many institutions offered summer workshops that were paid for through funds provided by the National Defense Education Act. The federal money not only covered the costs incurred by the college but also provided stipends for the elementary and secondary teachers who participated.

The results of this study should be significant to those who are interested in the long-term effect of college-level courses, workshops, and in-service activities that fostered new social studies concepts. How do teachers who participated in these activities report their behavior in the classroom? What are their feelings in regard to new social studies materials and practices? Do they use and/or develop teaching materials that are in harmony with new social studies philosophy? Again, this study should provide significant clues and insights regarding these questions.

Many questions about the present state of social studies education and the effects of the new social studies movement remain unanswered. In general, not enough is known about the extent to which innovative social studies programs have changed classroom practices. Elwell has described the situation:

The highly touted revolution in the social studies ages with each passing month, but how deeply that revolution has affected classroom behavior is unknown. This writer suspects, though, that little change in procedures, behavior, and emphasis, has been wrought in many social studies classrooms. But, and perhaps this is more significant, evidence of what goes on or has been changed in social studies classrooms is not available (underlining added).¹

ASSUMPTIONS

It was assumed that teachers generally use teaching materials in the intended manner. Some materials, if used in the recommended manner (according to the directions in the teacher handbook, for example), clearly tend toward an inquiry approach. Other materials, by their very nature, tend to be used with a deductive narrative approach.

DEFINITIONS

Several definitions are assumed or given. For example, attributes of the new social studies and traditional approaches are discussed in this chapter. These and other ideas--inquiry and conceptualization, for example--are defined or treated in more detail in Chapter 2.

¹William C. Elwell, "Where Are the Inquirers in Social Studies Education?" The Social Studies, 63 (December, 1972), 327.

LIMITATIONS

Much of the research data for this study relied on the self reports of teachers. This factor left open the possibility of reporting a distorted, although sincerely held, view of teacher practices and actions.

Another possible source of error was that scoring the questionnaire-opinionnaire forms involved delineations into the discrete categories which were established for this study. This meant that similar scores could fall into different categories. Also, it was difficult to exactly categorize classroom methods, materials, and organizations. As a result, the questionnaire-opinionnaire dealt with attributes and practices that tend to reflect particular approaches. However, it was still difficult to come to an exact decision as to whether or not a teacher reflected traditional or innovative practices.

There were some limitations that resulted from the assumption that teachers generally use teaching materials in the intended manner. Some teachers may not have used materials in the way the author(s) intended.

This study did not examine one aspect of the new social studies movement: an emphasis on attitudes and the valuing process. These affective areas, while important, were not included.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Differing views on the learning process and on proper philosophies and methodologies have long been a part of the study of education. As a result of these differences, it is possible to trace the rise and decline of a variety of ideas, theories, and approaches to teaching over a period of time. From the days of "faculty" psychology through the present day, psychologists and educators have argued the merits of diverse views. In like manner, educators have, at least since the time of Socrates, debated various philosophical positions on the purposes and goals of education. An important part of these psychological and philosophical discussions has centered on the proper role of social studies education.

APPROACHES TO SOCIAL STUDIES EDUCATION

The purpose of teaching social studies education has usually been related to citizenship education. However, there is considerably less agreement on how such classes should be selected, organized, and presented to students. Barth and Shermis developed a model to help explain and examine some of the major traditions in the social studies. They began by defining social studies as

"a set of goals which describes how the content of citizenship education is to be selected, organized and taught."¹ The authors developed three positions or models of social studies education. The first was described as: "social studies as citizenship transmission."²

When educators define social studies as citizenship transmission they see the purpose as producing students who are obedient to the norms of the community and who are tolerant of the rights of others. It is assumed that a good citizen is one who "has internalized the 'right' values, conforms, at least outwardly, to what is expected of him, votes regularly . . . and accepts the local community's concept of democracy."³ In like manner the role of the teacher is to inculcate obedience to the "right" values.

Barth and Shermis also described the teaching methodologies that are associated with the citizenship transmission approach. The teacher uses a combination of description and persuasion. The function of the teacher is to "describe events, people, phenomena, and ideas thought to be worthy of being learned by future citizens."⁴ There is an underlying assumption that certain events and

¹James L. Barth and S. Samuel Shermis, "Defining the Social Studies: An Exploration of Three Traditions," Social Education, 34 (November, 1970), 744.

²Ibid.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid.

phenomena are worthy of consideration and others are not. It is also assumed that "by and large teachers should persuade students of the ultimate rightness and wrongness of certain values."¹

Those who follow the citizenship transmission approach usually see content as a system of "facts, principles, beliefs, and theories which will be used (at a later time)."² Such content may be seen as irrelevant in the present, but useful in later life. It is assumed that the mind will retain the information and then, at the appropriate time, retrieve the needed facts and concepts. Followers of this approach also make the supposition that the content, once it has been established as "important," will remain important in the future. Content is selected as important based on the consensus of authorities and tradition. Little is said as to how the "facts" are gathered or determined.³

The second approach to social studies described in the Barth and Shermis model is called the "social science" position. Adherents to this philosophy believe that efforts in the social studies should center around the acquisition of knowledge through use of the social sciences. According to this view the purpose of social studies education is to acquire knowledge as an end in itself.

¹Ibid., p. 745.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., pp. 745-46.

If the knowledge should prove valuable later, so much the better. The authors suggest that this position is not clear regarding the significance of citizenship education. There is a tendency to disregard the citizenship aspect of social studies and emphasize knowledge for its own sake. However, there is an implied assumption that "possession of the knowledge and tools of a particular social science will, somehow, create a good citizen."¹

Followers of the social science position believe that the teaching methodologies should reflect social scientists' inquiry methods as the way to find truth. It is the function of the teacher to provide data that the student will learn to analyze. Results should include the transmission of social science concepts.²

Those who favor the social science position would have the content of classes defined by the ideas and concerns considered important by scholars in a particular social science discipline. The social science discipline involved also determines the mode of inquiry--including the concepts that are considered important. "Implicit in this approach is the assumption that one can really be more effective (as a citizen) if he is a junior historian, or a quasi-political scientist."³

¹Ibid., p. 747.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., pp. 747-48.

The third and final position in the Barth and Shermis model is called the "reflective inquiry" approach. Supporters of this position view the purpose of social studies as citizenship education. However, "citizenship is not defined as a pre-commitment to a given set of community norms or values but as a process."¹ It is assumed that all have to make decisions that will affect themselves and the community. Secondly, it is assumed that the choices will often be between alternatives that are ambiguous or in which there is no clear-cut choice between "good" and "evil." Therefore, it is supposed that social studies classes should provide experiences in the process of inquiring, reflecting, and arriving at conclusions.² Supporters of the reflective inquiry model agree with the social science position in that inquiry is stressed. However, their approach is not as structured, since the teacher does not establish the concepts and ideas to be learned prior to instruction. Instead, students are asked to identify significant problems and search for answers. The kinds of questions that might be considered are quite varied. Therefore, supporters of this position tend to believe that an interdisciplinary approach is desirable.³

¹Ibid., p. 748.

²Ibid., pp. 748-49.

³Ibid., p. 749.

The content of the reflective inquiry approach is similar to the content of the social science position. Students are asked to use concepts and knowledge from the social sciences to seek truth. But there is an important difference. Instead of establishing the content in advance, the teacher should define the content as the "data of inquiry."¹ No other prior definition of the content is needed or desirable.

Brubaker, Simon, and Williams developed another model which attempted to describe and analyze traditions in social studies education. Although some of the categories are similar to those developed by Barth and Shermis, there are additional refinements. The first category in the Brubaker, Simon, and Williams model speaks of those who see "social studies as knowledge of the past as a guide to good citizenship."² Those who adhere to this philosophy emphasize history as the focus and emphasis in teaching social studies. They tend to believe that knowledge and understanding of historical events will provide a sound basis for good citizenship. The authors presented this as a traditional position and equate it with a chronological narrative approach that places little

¹Ibid.

²Dale L. Brubaker, Lawrence H. Simon, and Jo Watts Williams, "A Conceptual Framework for Social Studies Curriculum and Instruction," Social Education, 41 (March, 1977), 201.

emphasis on interpretation. When this approach is used, all students are often expected to arrive at a consensus conclusion with causes, effects, ends, and means to ends agreed upon as demonstrated "facts" which are deductively presented by texts, teachers, or other authorities.¹

The second category described by Brubaker, Simon, and Williams was called the "social studies in the student centered tradition."² The progressive movement of the first half of the twentieth century exemplified this position. Proponents of this tradition stress the idea that the student should be the "source of all content" and that curriculum and instruction should be "based on the . . . nature, needs, and interests" of the students.³

Brubaker, Simon, and Williams referred to their third category as the "social studies as reflective inquiry" approach.⁴ Adherents to this position stress the idea that educators should establish conditions whereby students "inquiry into beliefs, values, and social policies, as well as the possible consequences and implications of possible alternatives."⁵ This position stresses the importance of students participating in the inquiry process; in fact, process may be emphasized over product.

¹Ibid., p. 202.

²Ibid., p. 203.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid.

The fourth position described by Brubaker, Simon, and Williams was called the "social studies as structure of the disciplines" approach. Followers of this model hold that students should learn the "basic concepts and methods of scholarly inquiry in the respective disciplines."¹ This group argues that the concepts provide "handles" which allow the learner to organize and manipulate facts. The goal is to teach students to think like social scientists, so that they will be able to apply these skills in adult life and thereby be better citizens.²

Brubaker, Simon, and Williams called their fifth and final category the "social studies as socio-political involvement" approach. Followers of this idea stress the students' willingness to face conflict and be "actively involved in the valuing process."³ In order to develop, exercise, and hold values, students must, it is argued, act upon professed beliefs. The teacher should, therefore, provide for experiences that encourage involvement. Conflict and disagreement are viewed as necessary and important parts of the learning process, but the highest form of learning is shown when a student acts on behalf of his beliefs.⁴

It is safe to say that teachers of social studies, as a group, have wide and diverse attitudes and philosophies

¹Ibid., p. 204.

²Ibid.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid.

regarding the purposes and goals of their instruction. There can be little doubt that any and all of the above mentioned positions are held by teachers in the 1970's. However, it is also true that a considerable group of educators has, between the mid-1960's and 1977, promoted a renewed emphasis on inquiry teaching and other associated teaching concepts. This "new social studies" movement has been the focus of much attention during that period.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE NEW SOCIAL STUDIES

The heart of the new social studies movement is a renewed stress on an inquiry approach to teaching. While the inquiry method is as old as teaching, the recent past has seen an added emphasis. In fact, the Education Index does not contain any listing of "inquiry" for the years 1930 through 1964. Likewise a Dictionary of Social Sciences published by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization in 1964 had no listings.¹ It was not until the late 1960's that the term became more generally used by teachers in the field. During the same period the new social studies flourished. It would, however, be a mistake to suggest that strong emphasis on the inquiry method of teaching is peculiar only to the late 1960's and early 1970's.

¹Margaret Stimann Branson, "Using Inquiry Methods in the Teaching of American History," Social Education, 35 (November, 1971), 776.

The inquiry approach, and therefore, the roots of the new social studies, is much older than the recent reemphasis. Several writers have been quick to stress the ancient origins of the discovery method. Eulie, for example, pointed out that Socrates was noted for using an inductive approach to teach the youth of Athens and that "good teachers and scholars have long used documents to enrich their teaching."¹

Several writers have noted that the ideas and principles espoused by John Dewey form the basis of the new social studies movement. Kohlberg, for example, stated that there are five postulates of the new social studies movement and that are all derived from Dewey. The first is "replacement of rote-learned facts by emphasis on active thought and reasoning." This involves applying inquiry and scientific methodologies to social material.² The second postulate of Dewey's cited by Kohlberg emphasizes the "distinction between the content of thinking and the form or process of thinking."³ The third new social studies ideal that Kohlberg attributed to Dewey is an emphasis on an interdisciplinary approach. The fourth

¹Joseph Eulie, "Structure and Strategies in the New Social Studies--An Evaluation," Journal of Secondary Education, 44 (January, 1969), 16.

²Lawrence Kohlberg, "Moral Development and the New Social Studies," Social Education, 37 (May, 1973), 370.

³Ibid.

stresses a problematical case-study method. Finally, Kohlberg stated that Dewey felt that valuing and value judgments should have a central role in education. "In contrast to the transmission of consensual values, the new social studies have been based on Dewey's conception of the valuing process."¹

Pearson believed that the new social studies owes much to the principles and ideas set forth by Dewey and Jerome Bruner. The emphasis on conceptualization, problem solving, interdisciplinary learning, and discovery were all attributed, in large measure, to Dewey and Bruner.² In the same vein, Laforse pointed out that "there is nothing very new or startling in the new social studies. It embodies a logic of inquiry largely derived from Dewey."³

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE NEW SOCIAL STUDIES

Although the ideas and approaches may be quite old, there is no doubt that the new social studies movement resulted in a reemphasis on inquiry and inductive reasoning. Writers were especially prolific during the

¹Ibid., pp. 370-71.

²Robert Pearson, "Beyond the New Social Studies," The Social Studies, 64 (December, 1973), 315.

³Martin Laforse, "The New Social Studies Mania: Pause for Thought," The Social Studies, 61 (December, 1970), 326.

late 1960's and early 1970's when the new social studies movement drew considerable attention.

Several writers attempted to define the movement by classifying the goals of various curriculum projects of the period. Many of the curricula had similarly stated objectives. Gerlach divided the goals into three clusters: (1) teaching about content, (2) developing cognitive skills, and (3) teaching about attitudes and values.¹ Fenton, a leader in the new social studies movement, developed a group of goals similar to Gerlach's.² Campbell, Sawyer, and Webster categorized the objectives of several social studies curriculum projects. While the labels and classifications differed in detail, they were substantially the same as Gerlach's and Fenton's.³ Trezise studied twenty-two curriculum projects in Michigan schools and also developed similar classifications.⁴

¹Ronald A. Gerlach, "Educational Objectives and the New Social Studies," School and Society, 99 (March, 1971), 181.

²Edwin Fenton, "History in the New Social Studies," Social Education, 30 (May, 1966), 326-28.

³Vincent Campbell, Susan F. Sawyer, and William J. Webster, PLAN Social Studies: The Match Between Long-Range Objectives and the 1970-71 Curriculum, U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 045 491, July, 1970.

⁴Robert Trezise, ed., Social Studies in Michigan, U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 051 067, 1971.

The terms "structure" and "process" have often been repeated by social studies curriculum analysts. Few aspects of the new social studies have been as generally agreed upon as the desire to stress these two ideas. Clements and Bruner have both explained what is meant by the terms. "The disciplines of history and the social studies are at once bodies of knowledge and methods of inquiry To make use of the disciplines in school is to ask young people to study as scholars in the field."¹ If students work as historians and social scientists, they will "learn the fundamental structure" of these disciplines.² Thus it was argued that students "learn how to learn" by practicing the same procedures that social scientists use. According to supporters of this approach, students should be able to learn a particular idea or basic understanding and then apply the idea or understanding in other situations. Bruner supported the position that transfer of learning takes place when a learner becomes familiar with the structure of social science disciplines. Bruner's belief in transfer is a major reason for his emphasis on structure.³

¹Millard Clements, "The Disciplines and Social Study," Effective Thinking in the Social Studies, ed. Jean Fair and Fannie R. Shaftel (Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1967), p. 67.

²Jerome S. Bruner, The Process of Education (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960), p. 11

³Ibid., p. 6.

Other writers have supported emphasis on transfer of learning. Eulie concluded that understanding will take place and "transfer of learning will occur when meaningful understanding is selected, many instances are used to illustrate, and it is taught so that pupils can understand it."¹ Schwab, Wehlage, and Clements have also discussed the principle of transfer and its relationship to the new social studies.²

As mentioned above, nearly all new social studies proponents are agreed that structure and process are best taught through methods that emphasize inquiry and inductive reasoning. Again, these ideas are not all new, but the advent of the new social studies movement resulted in a renewed stress on inquiry-oriented inductive learning. Barr summed up the position of new social studies advocates when he stated that "an inquiry model for history instruction is more useful in relation to demands for social change."³

¹Eulie, p. 16.

²Joseph J. Schwab, "The Concept of the Structure of the Discipline," The Educational Record, 43 (July, 1962), 197-205; Gary Wehlage, "Inquiry and Explanations," The High School Journal, 53 (November, 1969), 87; Clements, p. 57.

³Robert Dale Barr, "The Changing Role of History in American Public Schools," Dissertation Abstracts International, 30 (1970), 4671A (Purdue University).

In their works several writers have defined what is usually meant by "inquiry" or "discovery" teaching. Ausubel, for example, said discovery teaching takes place when the "principal content of what is to be learned is not given." This is opposed to "reception" learning which takes place when "the entire content of what is to be learned is presented to the learner in final form."¹ Hagen and Stansberry accepted the position that inquiry is the process by which a student, with a minimum of coaching from the teacher, "comes to perceive relationships among factors in his environment or between ideas that previously had no meaning or connection."²

Advocates of the inquiry approach support the view that a discovery method of teaching facilitates the transfer of learning to other situations that are different from the original experience. Hagen and Stansberry stated that inquiry learning is superior in that it promotes learning that broadens "the individual's potential for effective behavior in and out of school," because the learner is able to "see the relation of current learning to his life" and can "recognize situations where the new understanding or skill is appropriate" ³ Bruner

¹David P. Ausubel, The Psychology of Meaningful Verbal Learning (New York: Grune and Stratton, 1963), p. 16.

²Owen A. Hagen and Steve T. Stansberry, "Why Inquiry," Social Education, 33 (May, 1969), 535.

³Ibid., p. 537.

supported this view when he stated that learning should emphasize general ideas which "can then be used as a basis for recognizing subsequent problems as special cases of the idea originally mastered."¹ Hermann pointed out that Bruner and his supporters accept the notion that learning by discovery enables students to better organize information and to make it "more available for later application or problem solving."²

Another advantage to inquiry or discovery learning, according to its supporters, is that students "learn how to learn" when using this approach. Hagen and Stansberry agreed with this view and felt that "such inquiry procedures for seeking answers is useful to the pupil in any situation that might confront him." They also pointed out that Dewey took a similar view in regard to transfer and learning.³ Eulie summarized the new social studies inquiry-oriented position when he stated that it relies upon scholarship to teach understandings and develop critical thinking while hoping that "what is learned will be transferred to other situations."⁴

¹Bruner, p. 17.

²G. Hermann, "Learning by Discovery: A Critical Review of Studies," The Journal of Experimental Education, 38 (Fall, 1969), 59.

³Hagen and Stansberry, pp. 534-35.

⁴Eulie, p. 12.

Another characteristic of the new social studies theory is an emphasis on using social science concepts as a basic structure of the curriculum. Concepts--ideas about something which are formed by mentally combining all its characteristics--are general categories that are often used by historians and social scientists. Martorella defined the "nature of a concept" after examining the works of several writers, especially Bruner and Viaud: "a concept is a continuum of inferences by which a set of observed characteristics of an object or event suggests a class identity, and then additional inferences about unobserved characteristics of the object or event."¹ He illustrated his definition in the following way:

Country A has been externally controlled by Country B; from this the reader correctly infers "imperialism," which, in turn, suggests economic, political, and social domination of Country A by B In this case the report of external control of the country provided a set of observed characteristics, which suggested a class identity, denoted by a symbol, "imperialism," and then a chain of inferences from observed and unobserved properties.²

In examining the use of social science concepts, Fenton used social class, culture, and supply and demand as illustrations of important examples.³

¹Peter H. Martorella, "Classroom Concepts Learning: Issues and Research Perspectives," Social Education, 35 (December, 1971), 890.

²Ibid.

³Edwin Fenton, The New Social Studies (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967), p. 14.

Many writers have explained why they believe concepts and concept development should be stressed in social studies education. Taba called conceptualization "the basic form of cognition on which other cognitive processes depend."¹ Nelson argued in favor of a curriculum based solely on a "concept unit" approach--each unit would revolve around a theme such as "freedom," "change," or "democracy." This approach, he believed, would be particularly useful in promoting an interdisciplinary approach to teaching social studies.² Senesh said that a conceptually-based curriculum should be used at all grade levels. He called such an approach an "organic curriculum" and a natural way to teach fundamental social knowledge.³

Martorella discussed some problems that he felt complicated the teaching of concepts. He stated that the "optimal learning order, for example, of facts, generalizations, and theories related to a given social science concept . . . remains to be determined."⁴ He also said

¹Hilda Taba, "Implementing Thinking as an Objective in Social Studies," ed. Fair and Shaftel, p. 33.

²Jack L. Nelson, "The Concept Unit in Social Studies," The Social Studies, 56 (February, 1965), 46-48.

³Lawrence Senesh, "Organizing a Curriculum Around Social Science Concepts," Structure in Social Studies, ed. Louis J. Hebert and William Murphy (Washington, D. C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1967), pp. 57-64.

⁴Martorella, p. 890.

that the "most efficient relationship between concepts and non-concepts" is "an urgent instructional issue."¹

Many, but not all, new social studies advocates have favored an interdisciplinary approach in building social studies curricula. Ortgiesen and Keller, for example, both stated that it is desirable to subordinate the separate disciplines and concentrate on ideas and methodologies.² Others have taken an even stronger stand in favor of an interdisciplinary approach. Goldmark, for example, equated discipline-based classes with memorization of facts and a teacher-centered methodology. On the other hand, she argued that an integrated approach allows for "discovery" and development of "the whole child."³ She also concluded that inquiry and structure are nearly impossible to teach through traditional disciplines with their emphasis on textbooks and objective examinations.⁴ Kenworthy reported that courses concentrating entirely on

¹Ibid.

²Leroy Ortgiesen, A Position on K-12 Social Studies for Nebraska Schools, U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 039 152, 1968; Charles R. Keller, "A Revolution in the Social Studies: Still Needed?" The Social Studies, ed. Martin Feldman and Eli Serfman (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1969), p. 191.

³Bernice Goldmark, Social Studies: A Method of Inquiry (Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1968), p. 25.

⁴Ibid., pp. 35-39.

history or another social science discipline were still common. He went on to suggest that concepts or generalizations should form the structure of social studies classes. Using his model, a curriculum planner would apply knowledge from the various disciplines only after the structure had been established.¹ More recently Harris and Mings reported that an interdisciplinary approach to teaching American History was becoming more common and was being used in many high schools.²

Many supporters of the new social studies have stressed their belief that it is important for teachers to have access to inquiry-based teaching materials. This means that primary sources should be available and implies that a multi-text or multi-material approach be used. Both Weisenberg and Branson discussed the uses and limits of primary sources as aids to instruction.³ Sanders and Tanck also emphasized the importance of appropriate materials in establishing a successful inquiry-based program. They described and critiqued most of the

¹Leonard S. Kenworthy, "Changing the Social Studies Curriculum: Some Guidelines and a Proposal," Social Education, 32 (May, 1968), 482.

²Thomas C. Harris and Larry E. Mings, "The Revolution in American History," Curriculum Report (of the National Association of Secondary School Principals), 5 (April, 1976), 1-12.

³L. A. Weisenburg, "A Critique of the New Social Studies," The Social Studies, 59 (April, 1968), 169; Branson, p. 781.

materials that were developed by the national social studies projects during the late 1960's.¹ Since many teachers lack either the time or the skills to develop their own teaching materials, the availability and quality of commercially prepared materials is critical. Branson stated that even dedicated teachers rarely have time to develop materials or work out sophisticated strategies. She concluded that "most teachers must depend to a large degree upon commercially prepared materials."²

There is a very wide variation in the degree to which publishers have met the challenge to develop innovative materials. Some have developed exciting and useful teaching aids and books, while others have not. Brubaker, Simon, and Williams commented that several "diverse multi-media packages" are available, but some publishers "have simply introduced the label 'inquiry' in their textbook titles and advertisements."³

In addition to the factors mentioned above, researchers have emphasized the importance of teacher attitudes in effecting new social studies programs. Gerlach pointed out that the teacher must have a thorough

¹Norris M. Sanders and Marlin Tanck, "A Critical Appraisal of Twenty-Six National Social Studies Projects," Social Education, 34 (April, 1970), 383-388.

²Branson, p. 791.

³Brubaker, Simon, and Williams, p. 203.

understanding of and a clear commitment to the new social studies, if an innovative program is to be successful. The teacher will, in the final analysis, be the key person who will assess the program's value and will "adapt those materials and instructional strategies which best fit the student's needs" ¹ Massialas also analyzed the role of the inquiry-oriented social studies teacher and emphasized the importance of the teacher in developing a successful program. ²

CRITICS OF THE NEW SOCIAL STUDIES

While many educators have reacted very favorably to the new social studies movement, critics have commented on what they believe to be the less favorable aspects of the innovations. Kaplan, for example, attacked what he called the "myth of methodology" which states that "if we hit on the right methodology, progress will be rapid and sure." ³ Whittlemore echoed this sentiment. He felt that the new social studies proponents have often reduced every issue to questions which can be solved through empirical analysis. He believed that this premise would lead to

¹Gerlach, p. 180.

²Byron G. Massialas, "Inquiry," Today's Education, 48 (May, 1969), 41.

³Abraham Kaplan, The Conduct of Inquiry (San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1964), p. 24.

inadequate approaches to solving problems. The inquiry model, he felt, "has beguiled us into believing that it will serve every educational requirement."¹

Others have attacked the new social studies from another frame of reference. Eulie stated that the movement has not yet gone far enough to overcome the distinctions between the separate research disciplines. He accepted many of the basic tenets of the new social studies principles, but believed that more emphasis needed to be placed on the interdisciplinary nature of social knowledge. He also spoke of the need to select content from the latest and most up-to-date scholarship in examining social questions and problems.²

Eulie also spoke of other problems that sometimes develop when teachers become too enamored with new social studies concepts. He pointed out that the inquiry method can become tedious and time consuming if students are expected to "discover" most or all of the course content. He suggested that deductive learning is preferable to discovery in many situations--for example, a good narrative film. Eulie warned that, given their limited frames of reference, many students come to incomplete or false

¹Richard Whittlemore, "By Inquiry Alone?" Social Education, 34 (March, 1970), 282-83.

²Eulie, p. 13

conclusions, or at least conclusions that are in conflict with those of scholars.¹

Pearson pointed to several possible problem areas for new social studies teachers and curriculum builders. He showed particular concern for the role of the teacher and warned of the futility of expecting students to behave as junior-grade social scientists, if the teachers are not trained in research techniques. He likewise believed that too many teachers demand that students "discover" exactly the same "truths" that the teacher would discover. Pearson also criticized the work of some curriculum designers. He believed that they take a very narrow view of a particular discipline and require students to study areas that are of general interest only to scholars. Some historical material, he felt, is presented in such a way so as to not allow students to apply past events to present-day situations.²

Several researchers and writers have criticized what is perhaps the most basic tenet of the new social studies--that inductive teaching procedures are generally superior to other approaches. Lahnston pointed out that Ausubel, Carroll, and Cronback all argued that research has done little to show the superiority of either an

¹Ibid, p. 17.

²Pearson, pp. 316-17.

inductive or deductive approach.¹ He also completed a well controlled study that resulted in similar conclusions. Lahnston examined the effects of inductive and deductive methodologies on pupil achievement in third-grade geography classes. The groups studied were controlled for several variables including intelligence. The pupils were tested for mastery, immediate retention, immediate transfer, delayed retention, and delayed transfer. The results showed no significant difference between the inductive and deductive groups in any of these areas, except immediate retention on which the deductive group scored higher. There was also no significant relationship between intelligence quotient scores and response to either method.²

Chambers concluded that discovery learning had no significant effect on pupil learning when compared with deductive teaching methods. His results showed that overlearning (additional practice) has a more powerful influence than discovery in terms of mastery and transfer. He felt that practice or overlearning is necessary before a "discovered" principle can be transferred.³

¹Anton T. Lahnston, A Comparison of Directed Discovery and Demonstration Strategies for Teaching Geographic Concepts and Generalizations, U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 090 095, February, 1973.

²Ibid., pp. 5-9.

³David W. Chambers, Putting Down the Discovery Learning Hypothesis, U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 041 325, March, 1970.

Some have suggested that teacher behavior in classes perceived as process oriented is not very different from behavior of teachers in classes perceived as content oriented. Tinsley, Watson, and Marshall found that the kinds of questions asked, as coded by the Teacher-Pupil Question Inventory, did not vary significantly between classes that were perceived by students and teachers to be process oriented and those thought to be content oriented. In both categories of classes, lower level cognitive questions predominated.¹

Newton attacked the way that some curriculum developers have presented the inductive method. He pointed out that many materials do not emphasize the tentative nature of knowledge that is gained by not rejecting a hypothesis. Too many materials, he felt, allowed students to "inquire only so far that they cannot avoid driving at the right answer."²

Other critics have said that the new social studies movement presents a danger in that proponents sometimes present the innovations as the only "correct" way to

¹Drew C. Tinsley, Elizabeth P. Watson and Jon C. Marshall, Cognitive Objectives Revealed by Classroom Questions in "Process Oriented" and "Content Oriented" Secondary Social Studies Programs, U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 040 895, March, 1970.

²Richard F. Newton, "What's New About the New Social Studies?" The Social Studies, 63 (April, 1972), 161.

teach. They generally have expressed concern that educators are creating a neo-traditionalism which, in its own way, may prove as stifling as the methods which they seek to replace. Laforse expressed fear that narrative history and the "old social studies" would be "replaced by a concept of discovery which almost by design kills off pupil initiatives which generate excitement."¹ He found fault with many of the pre-packaged materials that are available. These materials, he felt, make the teacher's job easier but have an "excessively mechanical conception of inquiry" and "reduce the whole procedure to a ritual."²

Manson and Williams made similar observations when they spoke of "convergent" and "divergent" models of inquiry teaching. With a convergent model the conditions, processes, resources, and data are provided by the teacher who has "in all likelihood . . . thought through the problem and anticipated possible student responses."³ The teacher, knowing which response is conventionally accepted, presents the material in a manner that will assure the predicted conclusion. The student is, therefore, guided toward the "best" answer. Students structure their

¹Martin Laforse, "Why Inquiry Fails in the Classroom," Social Education, 34 (January, 1970), 81.

²Ibid.

³Gary Manson and Elmer D. Williams, "Inquiry: Does It Teach How or What to Think?" Social Education, 34 (January, 1970), 79.

thinking to that of the teacher and may wonder why a seemingly plausible answer is rejected. The divergent model allows the student to follow any number of possible paths, so long as the data supports the possibility. Manson and Williams believed that the convergent model is, at best, inferior to the divergent. It is, they suggested, simply another way of teaching students what to think rather than how to think, and they concluded that the convergent model may have an adverse affect on the student's ability to attack other tasks that require divergent thought.¹

Whittlemore pointed out that the academic intellectuals who wrote many of the materials that were developed by the government-funded social studies projects during the 1960's had little or no contact with elementary and high school students. The problem, he suggested, is that the research-oriented academicians predominated and those things that young people "identify as their needs are quite different from what the good grey professors think they should be."²

Where is the new social studies movement at present? Have the anticipated changes in content, emphasis, and teaching methods taken place? Laforse suggested that

¹Ibid., pp. 79-81.

²Whittlemore, p. 282.

few substantial changes are evident. He noted that the words "inductive," "discover," and "inquiry" are popular but wondered if programs and statements by state education departments have resulted in many fundamental changes.¹

PRESENT STATUS OF THE NEW SOCIAL STUDIES

In a recent report, Gross found little to support the view that basic changes have taken place in the past several years. Using figures obtained from state departments of education throughout the United States, he found evidence to indicate that there is no trend toward interdisciplinary studies. Instead he found that fewer students are taking world history, civics, senior problems, and geography classes. However, more are enrolled in economics, sociology, and psychology courses. In effect, the traditional standard classes have simply been replaced by those that emphasize social science disciplines.²

Gross found some conflicting evidence regarding the general acceptance of new social studies concepts. Three-fourths of the state departments of education officials surveyed reported that the new social studies

¹Laforse, "Why Inquiry Fails," p. 66.

²Richard E. Gross, "The Status of the Social Studies in the Public Schools of the United States: Facts and Impressions of a National Survey," Social Education, 41 (March, 1977), 196-197.

projects had materially affected teaching styles in secondary schools. However, the respondents also reported that the government-sponsored social studies projects had little affect on textbook selections, employment of teachers, and teacher training. They also indicated only a limited use of materials from the government-sponsored projects. Gross pointed to low sales of these materials as further evidence of the lack of enthusiasm for the fruits of these efforts.¹

A California study of high school teachers showed similar results. The bulk of the respondents reported that they employed the methodologies of the new social studies. However, seventy percent said that they did little to teach skill development. A majority of the teachers surveyed belonged to state and national social studies councils, yet a sizable proportion had not heard of several new social studies projects. Less than ten percent had tried materials from one of the major projects listed in the survey.²

Gross concluded that, in spite of conflicting evidence, some aspects of the new social studies are found in schools today. Textbooks, curriculum guides, and in-service education have utilized parts of the newer programs, and at least the terminology is known by many teachers.³

¹Ibid., p. 199.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., pp. 199-200.

Morressett studied the reports of social studies teachers who reacted to questions regarding the methods and approaches they and others preferred and used. The results showed that teachers generally thought that other teachers they knew were more conservative than themselves. The same respondents believed that teachers throughout the nation tended to be more traditional than the teachers they knew personally. All subgroups in the survey agreed that an historical emphasis dominates social studies education throughout the nation.¹

Cogan and Hunkins both concluded that the new social studies movement has not fulfilled earlier expectations to actually change curricular and instructional practices. Hunkins went on to suggest that the reason for this lack of significant impact is that curriculum builders and scholars directed nearly all of their attention to content and materials. They gave little concern to the technical aspects of how the reforms might be introduced and implemented in schools. Because of these "oversights," he suggested that "many of the innovations of the fifties and sixties failed to achieve

¹Irving Morressett, "Curriculum Information Network Sixth Report: Preferred Approaches to Teaching Social Studies," Social Education, 41 (March, 1977), 206-07.

maximum or even optimal utilization."¹

A few writers, however, have taken the position that changes--even significant changes--have taken place in the past few years. Barth and Shermis stated that the typical teacher tends to use methods and practices that are similar to those used by professors who taught him. Since most teachers were taught by "professors with at least one foot in the reflective inquiry tradition," they concluded that an eclectic approach, including some new social studies concepts, is used by most teachers.² Harris and Mings made a much stronger statement. They believed that a "revolution" has taken place in the teaching of American History. Most elements of the new social studies, according to their study, are being assimilated into the classroom materials and practices in schools throughout the nation. They admitted that the changes are taking place more slowly than many reformers would prefer; however, they concluded that changes are slowly and certainly taking place.³

¹John J. Cogan, "Social Studies: Past, Present, Future," Educational Leadership, 33 (January, 1976), 294; Francis P. Hunkins, "Building Curriculum: Influences and Mechanisms," Perspectives on Curriculum Development 1776-1976, ed. O. L. Davis, Jr. (Washington, D. C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1976), pp. 93-94.

²Barth and Shermis, pp. 750-51.

³Harris and Mings, pp. 1-12.

In general it seems that researchers and writers have arrived at conflicting conclusions regarding the impact of the new social studies movement and the present state of social studies curricula and instructional practices. Many have described, discussed, and argued the advantages or drawbacks that they find with concept-based inquiry-oriented learning in general and the new social studies in particular. Some writers have discussed the degree to which the new social studies approaches have been implemented in schools. Harris and Mings, for example, reported on innovative American History classes in selected schools. Gross studied the responses of officials in state education departments throughout the nation. However, few researchers, regardless of their conclusions, have systematically examined, either directly or indirectly, the situations that exist in classrooms or the present attitudes of teachers toward the new social studies. A statement by Gross summed up the present situations:

Perhaps large numbers of children and youth are being exposed to and involved in timely and revitalized sociocivic education. Our study and other critiques and research, however, lead us to seriously question such conclusions. This is an area ripe for thorough examination. We all know that new content approached in tired ways soon loses its glamour, or instruction about problems can be very different from involvement in inquiry. Large-scale investigations as to just what is going on in schoolrooms, both in content and techniques, is still badly needed.¹

¹Gross, p. 200.

The contemporary state of social studies education and the new social studies is not clear. Writers and researchers disagree on the present condition, and few have attempted to determine practices at the classroom level. This study sought to provide information on the present situation, by gathering and analyzing data about materials, methods, class organizations, and teacher opinions at the building level.

Chapter 3

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

This study was designed to determine which teaching methods and materials were being used by American History teachers in selected public high schools in Iowa. Also, the research examined the opinions of selected teachers toward the new social studies. In addition, the study surveyed the relationship among three selected variables-- (A) years of teaching experience, (B) number of class preparations, and (C) educational exposure to the new social studies--and teacher attitudes and instructional practices. The research concentrated on facets of social studies education that were closely associated with the new social studies movement. Emphasis was placed on American History, since it was a required subject. Selecting this subject provided a common base from which to study the problem.

The research focused on the following questions:

1. To what extent are "new social studies" methods, materials, and organizations used by American History teachers in selected public high schools in Iowa.¹

¹For the purposes of examining this and the following questions the following explanations are given. (A) The "methods" section of the questions dealt primarily with the

2. What opinions do teachers of American History in selected public high schools in Iowa hold toward new social studies techniques and concepts?

3. Is there a relationship (a) between selected variables and the use of new social studies methods, materials, and organizations; is there a relationship (b) between the variables and teacher opinions regarding the new social studies methods, materials, and organizations? The variables are:

(A) years of teacher experience

(B) number of class preparations

(C) educational exposure of the teacher to the new social studies--attendance at workshops or classes on the new social studies.

The design of the research centered around a questionnaire-opinionnaire which was sent to the building principals of thirty-five randomly selected Iowa high schools. The principals were asked to refer copies of the instrument to all American History teachers in the school. A stamped self-addressed envelope was included with a cover

teachers' responses as to how they present subject matter to students. Respondents checked their reactions to five teaching approaches and indicated to what degree they used each method. (B) The "materials" section of the questions dealt primarily with the teachers' responses as to what teaching materials they used. The materials listed, as explained on pages 53 and 54, were rated as to their compatibility with traditional or new social studies approaches. (C) The "organization" section of the questions dealt primarily with the teachers' responses as to whether or not they used any interdisciplinary approaches in presenting the materials in their classes.

letter and copies of the questionnaire-opinionnaire. Follow-up reminder letters were sent to those who responded slowly, and additional copies of the instrument were provided. In the case of those who did not respond to the second letter, a third letter--and another copy of the questionnaire-opinionnaire--was sent to the general title of "American History Teacher" in care of the school.¹

The information compiled from answers on the questionnaire-opinionnaire resulted in discrete data which was treated by a raw score-percentile method and by a non-parametric approach. Chi-square inferential analysis provided a test of independence.

The population included all American History teachers in Iowa public high schools, and the sample was comprised of the American History teachers in thirty-five randomly selected schools. To lessen the chance of selection bias the sample was stratified according to school size. One group included schools with fewer than 300 students in grades ten, eleven, and twelve. The second group had between 300 and 599 enrolled in these grades. The third category of schools had over 600 in grades ten through twelve. Enrollment figures for all schools were obtained from the Iowa High School Athletic Association.

¹Copies of the letters that were sent are found in Appendix A.

The instrument was sent to the building principal in order to gain official acceptance and cooperation. The principals' names were obtained from the Iowa Educational Directory. This permitted a personal hand-typed letter and probably helped secure a high response rate.¹

The data used in the study were obtained through a questionnaire-opinionnaire which was divided into three sections.² The first section produced data concerning the nature of teaching materials used by the teacher. The form also included questions about years of teaching experience, number of class preparations, and training in new social studies or inquiry concepts. The second section of the instrument was a questionnaire designed to elicit responses regarding the teaching methods used by the teacher. A Likert-type opinionnaire comprised the third and final section. This opinionnaire evoked opinions regarding traditional and new social studies ideals, philosophies, and teaching techniques.

The first section produced data that described both published and teacher-made materials used in classes. These materials were categorized by the writers and others

¹See Appendix B for a list of schools included in the sample and for a tabulation of the responses from each school.

²A reproduction of the questionnaire-opinionnaire can be found in Appendix C.

familiar with the various types of social studies concepts and media.¹ Three separate divisions were defined.

Category One was comprised of materials that were considered traditional and deductive in approach. Category Two included materials or combinations of materials that were an eclectic mixture of traditional and "new" or innovative. Category Three included materials that were compatible with new social studies concepts to a high degree. The replies of all respondents were classified as to whether their American History materials were predominantly in Category One, Two or Three. Those who judged the materials were given instructions regarding the criteria to use in classifying. Each judge rated the materials and gave a judgment. A consensus or majority opinion formed the basis for categorization.

The second section of the questionnaire-opinionnaire produced data concerning teaching methods used by the respondents. Teachers approximated the amount of classroom time devoted to the use of several different teaching techniques. The activities listed included those most likely to be compatible with traditional or with innovative

¹Those who judged the materials included a former high school history teacher, a public high school teacher, a parochial high school teacher, and the writer. All are familiar with traditional and new social studies-type materials and methods, and all have used a variety of approaches in teaching social studies.

approaches. The activities were rated on a four-point scale according to the degree to which they reflected a traditional or new social studies orientation. For example, when a teacher checked "lecture" as being "usually" used, this was designated as a "one." If a teacher checked "seldom," it was given a value of "four." The scoring was reversed for an activity such as simulation. While it is difficult to say with certainty which methods were used in traditional and which were used in an innovative manner, some patterns were assumed. Lectures and reading from narrative texts, for example could be associated with traditional classroom techniques. In contrast, group discussions, simulations, and individual conferences dealing with student projects tend to be associated with new social studies ideals.

Since five activities were listed, a score of twenty indicated a maximum use of innovative methods, and a score of five a maximum of traditional methodology. The results of the second section were broken down into categories in much the same manner as the first section. A total score of ten or less was classified as traditional, and a score of eleven through fifteen was scored as eclectic or a combination of traditional and innovative practices. Scores of sixteen through twenty ranked teachers as those predominantly using new social studies methods. As

with section one, respondents were ranked in Categories One, Two or Three--traditional, eclectic, or innovative (new social studies).

The third section of the instrument focused on teachers' opinions regarding identifiable characteristics of new social studies approaches to curriculum and instruction. Those polled responded by listing on a Likert-type scale their reactions to statements that either supported or opposed new social studies concepts. The teachers marked responses that were listed as "strongly agree," "agree," "disagree," and "strongly disagree." The responses were then tabulated on a four-point scale according to the degree to which they reflected a traditional or an innovative orientation. When a teacher marked "strongly agree" on a statement that was innovative in orientation, a score of four was given. An "agree" response received a three and a "disagree" a two. Those who marked "strongly disagree" were scored as one. Scoring was done in the opposite manner from those statements with a traditional orientation. Since there were ten statements, a score of forty indicated a highly favorable attitude toward new social studies concepts. A total score of ten showed a highly favorable attitude toward traditional approaches. It was recognized that, as with all opinionnaires, the respondents may have given answers that did not accurately reflect their true feelings.

This possibility is discussed in Chapter 5. Nevertheless, the results were treated in a similar manner as those in sections one and two. A score of twenty or less was rated as "traditional" and placed the respondent in Category One. Scores ranging from twenty-one through thirty placed the respondent in Category Two--eclectic in attitude. Scores above thirty were considered to reflect a very highly favorable attitude toward new social studies approaches and placed the teacher in Category Three. Note that in all three sections of the instrument the same labels were used:

Category One--traditional

Category Two--an eclectic mixture

Category Three--innovative or new social studies

The analysis was related to the questions and was carried out as follows:

1. To what extent are "new social studies" methods, materials, and organizations used by American History teachers in selected public high schools in Iowa? This question was descriptively answered by a raw-score count which was also converted to percentages. The number and percentage of teachers falling into each of the three categories was calculated and recorded to answer the first question.

2. What opinions do teachers of American History in selected Iowa public high schools hold toward new social studies techniques and concepts? Again, a descriptive

determination of raw scores and percentages were used, and teachers were placed in one of the three categories.

3. Is there a relationship (a) between selected variables; the use of new social studies methods, materials, and organizations; is there a relationship (b) between the variables and teacher opinions regarding the new social studies? The variables were (A) years of teacher experience, (B) number of class preparations, and (C) educational exposure to the new social studies--attendance at workshops or classes on the new social studies.

For each variable the data was organized to meet the special requirements involved. For "years of teacher experience" three groupings were created: (1) those with one through three years experience, (2) those with four through seven years experience, and (3) those with over seven years experience. These groupings were established because of their relationship to the historical development of the new social studies movement. Teachers with more than seven years experience would likely have finished their undergraduate training and begun teaching prior to the renewed emphasis on inquiry and the general awareness of the new social studies movement. Those with four through seven years experience would likely have received their undergraduate training during the period when a renewed emphasis on stressing inquiry was popular. Teachers with fewer than

four years experience would likely have completed their schooling during a time when the new social studies ideals were considered conventional wisdom.

After the data from each respondent was placed in the proper group, a statistical analysis determined if a significant difference existed between the teachers in the various groups in regard to materials, methods, organization, and opinions about new social studies concepts. The number of teachers, for example, in the group with four through seven years experience and placed in Category One relative to teaching methods was determined after examining the data. Then chi-square analysis determined whether or not the number of teachers in that group and category varied significantly from what could be expected by chance. A similar procedure was followed for Category Two and Category Three for teachers with fewer than four years experience and for teachers with more than seven years experience. The same basic statistical procedures were used on the data regarding materials, class organization, and teacher opinions.

Number of class preparations, the second variable, was chosen because it is closely related to the amount of time that a teacher can devote to planning classes and preparing materials for student use. To facilitate statistical analysis teachers were grouped into three categories: (1) teachers with one class preparation,

(2) teachers with two preparations, and (3) teachers with three or more preparations. The statistical treatment was similar to that used to analyze the first variable, years of teacher experience. In this instance, the data from the respondents was again grouped and chi-square analysis determined whether or not any significant differences existed relative to the methods, materials, class organizations, and opinions about new social studies approaches.

The third variable, educational exposure to the new social studies, was statistically examined in a manner similar to the first two variables. Teacher responses formed two groups: (1) those who had participated in workshops or classes, and (2) those who had not participated in workshops or classes. Again, chi-square analysis determined whether or not there were significant differences between the two groups relative to methods, materials, class organizations, and opinions.

A null hypothesis was tested for each of three variables examined. The null hypothesis for the first variable, years of teacher experience, was stated as follows: (1) There is no significant difference among the respondents in the three experience groups (those with one through three years, those with four through seven years, and those with over seven years) in relation to methods, materials, organizations, and opinions about new social

studies ideals. The null hypothesis for the second variable, number of class preparations, was stated:

(2) There is no significant difference among the respondents in the three preparation groups (those with one preparation, those with two preparations, and those with three or more preparations) in relation to methods, materials, class organizations, and opinions about new social studies ideals. The null hypothesis for the third variable, educational exposure to the new social studies, was stated: (3) There is no significant difference between the respondents in the two groups (those who have participated in classes or workshops, and those who have not participated in classes or workshops) in relation to methods, materials, class organizations, and opinions about new social studies ideals.

In all cases chi-square analysis was used, and the significance level was set at the .05 level. Thus any rejection of a null hypothesis would indicate that the results would have resulted from sampling error fewer than five out of one-hundred times.

Chapter 4

FINDINGS

The data and research examined the present state of American History education in selected Iowa public high schools. Teaching methods, materials, class organizations, and opinions about new social studies ideals were especially examined. The following questions were investigated:

1. To what extent are new social studies methods, materials, and organizations used by American History teachers in selected public high schools in Iowa?

2. What opinions do teachers of American History in selected public high schools in Iowa hold toward new social studies techniques and concepts?

3. Is there a relationship (a) between selected variables and the use of new social studies methods, materials, organizations; is there a relationship (b) between the variables and teacher opinions regarding the new social studies methods, materials, and organizations? The variables are:

- (A) years of teacher experience
- (B) number of class preparations
- (C) educational exposure of the teacher to the new social studies--attendance at workshops or classes on the new social studies

To gather the necessary information a questionnaire-opinionnaire was sent to thirty-five randomly selected schools throughout the state of Iowa. To help insure a truly random sample and reduce the chance of bias, the sample was stratified on the basis of schools enrollment. A list of the schools selected is shown in Appendix B.

Teachers from thirty-four of the thirty-five schools returned questionnaire-opinionnaire forms. Since most of the schools had only one American History teacher, one response came from the majority of schools. Multiple responses came from most of the larger schools. The largest single response came from a school in which four teachers returned forms. It is not known with certainty how many did not respond, because the exact number of American History teachers in each school was not available. However, teachers from ninety-seven percent of the schools responded. Overall, the sampling procedure secured a high response rate.

An analysis of the first question; dealing with the use of new social studies methods, materials, and organizations; showed the following results. All forty-four of the respondents completed the section of the form dealing with methods. The results are shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Number and Percentage of Respondents in Categories
One, Two and Three Relative to Methods

	Traditional	Eclectic	New Social Studies
	Category One	Category Two	Category Three
Number	14	28	2
Percentage	32	64	4

Scoring showed that fourteen, or 32 percent, of the teachers reported using teaching approaches scored as Category One--traditional. Twenty-eight, or 64 percent of the responses fell into Category Two--eclectic or mixed. Two, or 4 percent, showed results scored as Category Three--predominantly using new social studies methodologies.

In the section of the questionnaire, which dealt with materials, forty-three of the forty-four respondents gave complete information. All but one of the teachers used a basic text, although one used an economics book as the basis for an American History class. Thirty also listed one or more examples of supplementary materials that they used. Fifteen, or 35 percent, used materials that could be classified predominantly as Category One--traditional. The materials used by twenty-four, or 56 percent, were judged as predominantly in Category Two--

mixed or eclectic. The remaining four, or 9 percent, used materials designated as Category Three--highly compatible with a new social studies approach.¹ The results of the second part of the first question are shown in Table 2.

Table 2

Number and Percentage of Respondents in Categories One, Two and Three Relative to Materials

	Traditional	Eclectic	New Social Studies
	Category One	Category Two	Category Three
Number	15	24	4
Percentage	35	56	9

All forty-four respondents answered the questions dealing with class organizations--the use or non-use of interdisciplinary approaches. The results are shown in Table 3. Twenty-nine, or 66 percent of the teachers, said that they used interdisciplinary methods or materials in their

¹A list of the basic textbooks cited by respondents and the number of teachers using each is provided in Appendix D. Teachers in the various schools cited a total of eighteen different texts. Over one-third of the respondents used Rise of the American Nation published by Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich. Harcourt Brace and Houghton Mifflin produced half of the textbooks used by teachers in the survey.

approach to American History. Most gave examples of the kinds of materials or methods used. A few responded that they used interdisciplinary approaches but gave examples that could not be considered interdisciplinary. These were scored as "no"--not using interdisciplinary methods or materials. Several teachers reported that they included political science concepts and materials in their classes. Others mentioned economic, sociological and anthropological materials and approaches.

Table 3

Number and Percentage of Respondents Using and Not Using Interdisciplinary Approaches

Interdisciplinary	Number	Percentage
Yes	29	66
No	15	34

The second question of the study dealt with the opinions of teachers as they responded to a series of questions related to attitudes toward new social studies approaches. Forty-three teachers completed this section of the questionnaire-opinionnaire. The results are shown in Table 4. None of the respondents' scores fell into the range designated as Category One--traditional. Thirty-four, or 79 percent, were in Category Two--mixed

or eclectic. The remaining nine teachers, or 21 percent, scored in Category Three--showing a highly favorable attitude toward new social studies ideals.

Table 4

Number and Percentage of Respondents in Categories
One, Two, and Three Relative to Attitudes
Toward New Social Studies

	Category One	Category Two	Category Three
Number	0	34	9
Percentage	0	79	21

The third question of the study centered around the relationship of selected variables to the use of new social studies methods, materials, and organizations and the relationship between the variables and teacher opinions regarding the new social studies methods, materials, and organizations. The selected variables were: (A) years of teacher experience, (B) number of class preparations, and (C) educational exposure of the teacher to the new social studies--attendance at workshops or classes on the new social studies. Analysis of respondents' answers required the use of chi square inferential analysis as a test of independence.

The null hypothesis for the first variable, years of teacher experience was stated as follows: There is no significant difference between the respondents in the three experience groups (those with one through three years, those with four through seven years, and those with over seven years) in relation to methods, materials, class organizations, and opinions about new social studies ideals. The level of significance for this and the following questions was set at the .05 level.

The first part of the null hypothesis examined the relationship between teaching methods and years of experience. Analysis of the teachers' responses related to this section is shown in Table 5. The analysis resulted in a chi-square value of 3.637. With four degrees of freedom a value of 9.49 is required to reject the null hypothesis; therefore it was retained.¹

¹The analysis shown uses a 3 x 3 chi square format. Statisticians generally agree that standard chi square analysis should not be used, for fear of making a Type I error, when expected frequencies in more than twenty percent of the cells are less than five. However, the figures are shown in this table and in following tables when the null hypothesis is accepted. This practice is followed, since a Type I error is not possible in that situation.

Table 5

Analysis of Relationship Between Years of Experience
and Teaching Methods

	Traditional	Eclectic	New Social Studies
Experience	Category One	Category Two	Category Three
1-3 years	1 (1.59)	4 (3.18)	0 (.22)
4-7 years	6 (3.8)	6 (7.63)	0 (.54)
over 7	7 (8.59)	18 (17.18)	2 (1.22)
Totals	14	28	2

Observed frequencies are the whole numbers; expected frequencies are the decimals shown in parentheses.

$$f_o \quad f_e \quad (f_o - f_e) \quad (f_o - f_e)^2 \quad \frac{(f_o - f_e)^2}{f_e}$$

1	1.59	-.59	.348	.22	df=4 $\Sigma = 3.637$ A value of 9.49 is needed for signif- icance at .05 level.
6	3.8	2.2	4.84	1.27	
7	8.59	-1.59	2.51	.29	
4	3.18	.82	.67	.21	
6	7.63	-1.63	2.657	.348	
18	17.18	.82	.672	.039	
0	.22	-.22	.048	.22	
0	.54	-.54	.29	.54	
2	1.22	.78	.61	.5	

The second part of the null hypothesis focused on the relationship between teaching materials and years of experience. Analysis of the teachers' responses related to this section is shown in Table 6. The analysis showed a chi square value of 6.02. Again, at four degrees of freedom 9.49 is needed to reject the null hypothesis at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained.

Table 6

Analysis of the Relationship Between Years of Experience and Teaching Materials

	Traditional	Eclectic	New Social Studies
Experience	Category One	Category Two	Category Three
1-3 years	3 (1.73)	2 (2.79)	0 (.47)
4-7 years	2 (3.84)	9 (6.14)	0 (1.02)
over 7	10 (9.42)	13 (15.07)	4 (2.51)
Totals	15	24	4

Observed frequencies are shown as whole numbers; expected frequencies are shown as decimals in parentheses.

f_o	f_e	$(f_o - f_e)$	$(f_o - f_e)^2$	$\frac{(f_o - f_e)^2}{f_e}$	
3	1.74	1.26	1.59	.91	
2	3.84	1.84	3.34	.87	df=4
10	9.42	.58	.34	.04	$\Sigma=6.02$
2	2.79	-.79	.62	.22	A value of 9.49 is
9	6.14	2.86	8.18	1.33	needed for signif-
13	15.07	-2.07	4.28	.28	icance at .05
0	.47	-.47	.22	.47	level.
0	1.02	-1.02	1.04	1.02	
4	2.51	1.49	2.22	.88	

The third part of the null hypothesis examined the relationship between class organizations--the use or non-use of interdisciplinary approaches--and years of teacher experience. Analysis of the teachers' responses related to this section is shown in Table 7. The analysis resulted in a chi square value of .6. At two degrees of freedom 5.99 is required to reject the null hypothesis, so no significance was established.

Table 7

Analysis of the Relationship Between Years of Experience and Class Organizations

Interdisciplinary	1-3 years	4-7 years	over 7	Totals
Yes	3 (3.29)	7 (7.91)	19 (17.79)	29
No	2 (1.7)	5 (4.09)	8 (9.2)	15

Observed frequencies are shown as whole numbers; expected frequencies are shown as decimals in parentheses.

f_o	f_e	$(f_o - f_e)$	$(f_o - f_e)^2$	$\frac{(f_o - f_e)^2}{f_e}$	
3	3.29	-.29	.084	.02	
7	7.91	-9.09	.826	.10	df=2
19	17.79	1.21	1.46	.08	$\Sigma = .6$
2	1.7	.3	.09	.05	A value of 5.99 is
5	4.09	.91	.82	.2	needed for signif-
8	9.2	-1.2	1.44	.15	icance at .05 level.

The fourth part of the null hypothesis concerned the relationship between years of teacher experience and teacher opinions regarding new social studies methods,

materials, and organizations. Analysis of the teachers' responses related to this section is shown in Table 8. The analysis resulted in a chi square value of 7.43. At two degrees of freedom 5.99 is needed to reject the null hypothesis. There were two degrees of freedom, since there were no teachers in Category One relative to opinions. Thus a 3 x 2 cell configuration resulted. However, the expected frequencies in three cells were fewer than five. Therefore the null hypothesis could not be rejected without further analysis. To accomplish this it was necessary to collapse the data into four cells. To make this possible the respondents were divided into two experience groups: (1) those with one through seven years experience and (2) those with over seven years experience. The results left one of the four cells with an expected frequency of less than five. The treatment of such statistics required the use of "Yates' Correction," a statistical procedure which corrects exaggerations that result from small expected frequencies.¹ The analysis of the results is shown in Table 9. The results showed a chi square value of 5.5. At one degree of freedom a value of 3.84 is required to reject the null hypothesis at the

¹Yates' Correction, an adaptation of regular chi square analysis, is expressed as follows: $\frac{[(f_o - f_e) - .5]^2}{f_e}$

.05 level, and 5.41 is needed to reject at the .02 level. At the .01 level 6.64 is required; therefore, significance was shown at the .02 level.

Examination of the cells with their observed and expected frequencies showed that a higher than expected number of teachers with over seven years experience fell into Category Three. In fact all of the teachers in Category Three had eight or more years experience. By the same token a higher than expected number of teachers with one through seven years experience fell into Category Two, and a smaller than expected number of teachers with more than seven years experience were in Category Two. Analysis of the data supports a hypothesis that teachers with over seven years experience express opinions more favorable toward new social studies ideals than do teachers with one through seven years experience.

The null hypothesis for the first variable, years of teacher experience, included four subsections which dealt with methods, materials, class organizations and teacher opinions. The null hypothesis was upheld for methods, materials, and class organizations. The null hypothesis regarding teacher experience and opinions was rejected.

Table 8

Analysis of the Relationship Between Years of Experience
and Teachers' Opinions

	Eclectic	New Social Studies
Experience	Category Two	Category Three
1-3 years	5 (3.95)	0 (1.04)
3-7 years	12 (9.48)	0 (2.51)
over 7	17 (20.55)	9 (5.44)
Totals	34	9

Observed frequencies are shown as whole numbers; expected frequencies are shown as decimals in parentheses.

$$f_o \quad f_e \quad (f_o - f_e) \quad (f_o - f_e)^2 \quad \frac{(f_o - f_e)^2}{f_e}$$

5	3.9	1.1	1.21	.31	df=2
12	9.48	2.52	6.35	.67	$\Sigma=7.44$
17	20.5	-3.5	12.25	.59	A value of 5.99 is
0	1.04	-1.04	1.08	1.04	needed for signif-
0	2.5	-2.5	6.25	2.5	icance at .05
9	5.44	3.56	12.67	2.33	level.

Table 9

Analysis of the Relationship Between Years of Experience
and Teacher Opinions Using
Yates' Correction

	Eclectic	New Social Studies
Experience	Category Two	Category Three
1-7 years	17 (13.44)	0 (3.56)
over 7	17 (20.56)	9 (5.44)
Totals	34	9

Observed frequencies are shown as whole numbers; expected frequencies are shown as decimals in parentheses.

$$f_o \quad f_e \quad (f_o - f_e) - .5 \quad \frac{[(f_o - f_e) - .5]^2}{f_e}$$

17	13.44	3.06	9.36	.70
17	20.56	-3.06	9.36	.45
0	3.56	-3.06	9.36	2.63
9	5.44	3.06	9.36	1.72

df=1

$\Sigma = 5.5$

A value of 3.84 is needed
for significance at .05
level.

The null hypothesis for the second variable, number of class preparations, was stated as follows: There is no significant difference between the respondents in the three preparation groups (those with one preparation, those with two preparations, and those with three or more preparations) in relation to methods, materials, class organizations, and opinions about new social studies ideals.

The first part of the null hypothesis dealt with the relationship between teaching methods and number of class preparations. Analysis of the teachers' responses related to this section is shown in Table 10. The analysis resulted in a chi square value of 7.56. With two degrees of freedom a value of 9.49 is required to reject the null hypothesis, so it was retained. However, the chi square value was relatively high. To further analyze the data a 2 x 2 cell configuration was formed by combining Categories Two and Three and by dividing the teachers into two preparation groups: those with one or two preparations and those with three or more preparations. The results are shown in Table 11. The analysis resulted in a chi square value of 2.86. A value of 3.84 was needed to show a significant difference with one degree of freedom at the .05 level. The chi square value showed significance at the .10 level; however, this was not enough to reject the null hypothesis.

Table 10

Analysis of the Relationship Between Number of
Class Preparations and Teaching Methods

	Traditional	Eclectic	New Social Studies
Preparations	Category One	Category Two	Category Three
1	0 (1.9)	6 (3.8)	0 (.3)
2	5 (5.7)	11 (11.5)	2 (.8)
3 or more	9 (6.4)	11 (12.7)	0 (.9)
Totals	14	28	2

Observed frequencies are shown as whole numbers; expected frequencies are shown as decimals in parentheses.

f_o	f_e	$(f_o - f_e)$	$(f_o - f_e)^2$	$\frac{(f_o - f_e)^2}{f_e}$	
0	1.9	1.9	3.61	1.9	
5	5.7	-.7	.49	.09	df=4
9	6.4	2.6	6.76	1.06	$\Sigma = 7.56$
6	3.8	2.2	4.84	1.27	A value of 9.49 is
11	11.4	-.4	.16	.01	needed for signif-
11	12.7	-1.7	2.89	.23	icance at .05
0	.3	-.3	.09	.3	level.
2	.8	1.2	1.44	1.8	
0	.9	-.9	.81	.9	

Table 11
 Analysis of the Relationship Between Number of
 Class Preparations and Teaching Methods
 in a 2 x 2 Configuration

	Traditional	Eclectic and New Social Studies
Preparations	Category One	Categories Two and Three
1 or 2	5 (7.6)	19 (16.4)
3 or more	9 (6.4)	11 (13.6)
Totals	14	30

Observed frequencies are shown as whole numbers; expected frequencies are shown as decimals in parentheses.

f_o	f_e	$(f_o - f_e)$	$(f_o - f_e)^2$	$\frac{(f_o - f_e)^2}{f_e}$	
5	7.6	-2.6	6.76	.89	df=1
9	6.4	2.6	6.76	1.06	$\Sigma=2.86$
19	16.4	2.6	6.76	.41	A value of 3.84 is
11	13.6	-2.6	6.76	.5	needed for signif-
					icance at .05 level.

The second part of the null hypothesis focused on the relationship between teaching materials and the number of class preparations. Analysis of the teachers' responses related to this section is shown in Table 12. The analysis resulted in a chi square value of 5.3. A value of 9.49 is required to show significance at four degrees of freedom, so the null hypothesis was upheld.

Table 12

Analysis of the Relationship Between Number of
Class Preparations and Teaching Materials

	Traditional	Eclectic	New Social Studies
Preparations	Category One	Category Two	Category Three
1	4 (2.09)	2 (3.35)	0 (.56)
2	6 (6.28)	9 (10.05)	3 (1.67)
3 or more	5 (6.63)	13 (10.6)	1 (1.77)
Totals	15	24	4

Observed frequencies are shown as whole numbers; expected frequencies are shown as decimals in parentheses.

f_o	f_e	$(f_o - f_e)$	$(f_o - f_e)^2$	$\frac{(f_o - f_e)^2}{f_e}$	
4	2.09	1.91	3.65	1.75	
6	6.28	.28	.08	.01	df=4
5	6.63	-1.63	2.66	.40	$\Sigma=5.3$
2	3.35	1.35	1.82	.54	A value of 9.49 is
9	10.05	-1.05	1.10	.11	needed for signif-
13	10.6	2.4	5.76	.54	icance at .05
0	.56	-.56	.31	.56	level.
3	1.67	1.33	1.77	1.06	
1	1.77	-.77	.59	.33	

The third part of the null hypothesis examined the relationship between class organizations--the use or non-use of interdisciplinary approaches--and the number of class preparations. Analysis of the teachers' responses related to this section is shown in Table 13. The analysis resulted in a chi square value of 2.19. A value of 5.99 was needed at two degrees of freedom in order to reject the null hypothesis, so no significance was established.

Table 13

Analysis of the Relationship Between Number of
Class Preparations and Class Organizations

Interdisciplinary	1 prep.	2 preps.	3 or more preps.
Yes	5 (3.59)	13 (11.86)	11 (13.18)
No	1 (2.05)	5 (6.14)	9 (6.82)

Observed frequencies are shown as whole numbers; expected frequencies are shown as decimals in parentheses.

f_o	f_e	$(f_o - f_e)$	$(f_o - f_e)^2$	$\frac{(f_o - f_e)^2}{f_e}$	
5	3.95	1.05	1.10	.28	df=2
13	11.86	1.14	1.3	.11	$\Sigma = 2.19$
11	13.18	2.18	4.75	.36	A value of 5.99 is
1	2.05	1.05	1.10	.54	needed for signif-
5	6.14	1.14	1.3	.2	icance at .05
9	6.82	2.18	4.75	.7	level.

The fourth part of the null hypothesis dealt with the relationship between teacher opinions regarding new social studies ideals and number of class preparations. Analysis of the teachers' responses related to this section is found in Table 14. The analysis resulted in a chi square value of 3.37. A value of 5.99 was required to establish significance at two degrees of freedom, so the null hypothesis was retained.

Table 14
Analysis of the Relationship Between Number of
Class Preparations and Teacher Opinions

	Eclectic	New Social Studies
Preparations	Category Two	Category Three
1	3 (4.7)	3 (1.3)
2	14 (13.4)	3 (3.6)
3 or more	17 (15.8)	3 (4.2)
Totals	34	9

Observed frequencies are shown as whole numbers; expected frequencies are shown as decimals in parentheses.

f_o	f_e	$(f_o - f_e)$	$(f_o - f_e)^2$	$\frac{(f_o - f_e)^2}{f_e}$	
3	4.7	-1.7	2.89	.6	df=2
14	13.4	.6	.36	.02	$\Sigma = 3.37$
17	15.8	1.2	1.44	.09	A value of 5.99 is
3	1.3	1.7	2.89	2.22	needed for signifi-
3	3.6	-.6	.36	.1	cance at .05 level.
3	4.2	-1.2	1.44	.34	

The null hypothesis for the second variable, number of class preparations, included four subsections which focused on methods, materials, class organizations, and teachers opinions. The results showed no significant relationship between the number of class preparation and any of the four factors.

The null hypothesis for the third variable, educational exposure to the new social studies--attendance at workshops or classes on the new social studies--was stated as follows: There is no significant difference between the respondents in the two groups (those who have participated in classes or workshops and those who have not participated in classes or workshops) in relation to methods, materials, class organizations, and opinions about the new social studies.

The first part of this null hypothesis examined the relationship between teaching methods and educational exposure to the new social studies. Analysis of the teachers' responses related to this section is shown in Table 15. The analysis showed a chi square value of 1.56. At two degrees of freedom a value of 5.99 was required to show significance, so the null hypothesis was upheld.

Table 15

Analysis of the Relationship Between Educational
Exposure to the New Social Studies
and Teaching Methods

	Traditional Eclectic		New Social Studies		
Classes/ Workshops	Category One	Category Two	Category Three	Total	
Yes	7 (8.3)	16 (16.5)	2 (1.2)	26	
No	6 (5.7)	12 (11.5)	0 (.8)	18	

Observed frequencies are shown as whole numbers; expected frequencies are shown as decimals in parentheses.

f_o	f_e	$(f_o - f_e)$	$(f_o - f_e)^2$	$\frac{(f_o - f_e)^2}{f_e}$	
7	8.3	-1.3	1.69	.20	df=2
16	16.5	-.5	.25	.02	$\Sigma=1.56$
2	1.2	.8	.64	.53	A value of 5.99 is
6	5.7	.3	.09	.02	needed for signif-
12	11.5	.5	.25	.02	icance at .05
0	.8	-.8	.64	.8	level.

The second part of the null hypothesis for this variable dealt with the relationship between teaching materials and the teachers' educational exposure to the new social studies. Analysis of the teachers' responses related to this section is shown in Table 16. Analysis resulted in a chi square value of .72. A value of 5.99 was required to reject the null hypothesis at two degrees of freedom, so no significance was shown.

Table 16

Analysis of the Relationship Between Educational
Exposure to the New Social Studies and
Teaching Materials

	Traditional	Eclectic	New Social Studies	
Classes/ Workshops	Category One	Category Two	Category Three	Total
Yes	8 (9.07)	15 (14.51)	3 (2.42)	26
No	7 (5.93)	9 (9.49)	1 (1.58)	17

Observed frequencies are shown as whole numbers; expected frequencies are shown as decimals in parentheses.

f_o	f_e	$(f_o - f_e)$	$(f_o - f_e)^2$	$\frac{(f_o - f_e)^2}{f_e}$	
8	9.07	-1.07	1.14	.13	df=2
15	14.51	.49	.24	.02	$\Sigma = .72$
3	2.42	.58	.34	.14	A value of 5.99 is
7	5.93	1.07	1.14	.19	needed for signif-
9	9.49	-.49	.24	.02	icance at .05
1	1.58	-.58	.34	.22	level.

The third part of this null hypothesis centered on the relationship between class organizations--use of non-use of interdisciplinary approaches--and teachers' educational exposure to the new social studies. Analysis of the teachers' responses to this section is shown in Table 17. The analysis showed a chi square value of 3.52. A value of 3.84 was needed to show significance at the .05 level. The chi square value indicated significance at the .10 level; however, this was not enough to reject the null hypothesis.

Table 17

Analysis of the Relationship Between Educational Exposure to the New Social Studies and Class Organizations

Classes/ Workshops	Interdisciplinary	Non-Interdisciplinary
Yes	20 (17.1)	6 (8.9)
No	9 (11.9)	9 (6.1)

Observed frequencies are shown as whole numbers; expected frequencies are shown as decimals in parentheses.

f_o	f_e	$(f_o - f_e)$	$(f_o - f_e)^2$	$\frac{(f_o - f_e)^2}{f_e}$	
20	17.1	2.9	8.41	.49	df=1
9	11.9	-2.9	8.41	.71	$\Sigma=3.52$
6	8.9	-2.9	8.41	.94	A value of 3.84 is
9	6.1	2.9	8.41	1.38	needed for signif-
					icance at .05 level.

The fourth part of the null hypothesis examined the relationship between teachers' opinions about new social studies ideals and their educational exposure to the new social studies. Analysis of the responses to this section is shown in Table 18. The analysis resulted in a chi square value of .088. A value of 3.84 was required to show significance at the .05 level at one degree of freedom, so the null hypothesis was retained.

Table 18

Analysis of the Relationship Between Educational
Exposure to the New Social Studies and
Teacher Opinions

Classes/Workshops	Category Two	Category Three
Yes	21 (20.6)	5 (5.4)
No	13 (13.4)	4 (3.6)

Observed frequencies are shown as whole numbers; expected frequencies are shown as decimals in parentheses.

f_o	f_e	$(f_o - f_e)$	$(f_o - f_e)^2$	$\frac{(f_o - f_e)^2}{f_e}$	
21	20.6	.4	.16	.008	df=1
5	5.4	-.4	.16	.03	$\Sigma = .088$
13	13.4	-.4	.16	.01	A value of 3.84 is
4	3.6	.4	.16	.04	needed for signif-
					icance at .05 level.

The null hypothesis for the third variable, educational exposure to the new social studies--attendance at workshops or classes on the new social studies, included four subsections which dealt with methods, materials, class organizations, and teacher opinions. The results showed no significant relationship between educational exposure to the new social studies and any of the four variables.

Answers to the questions examined in this study provided information about the present state of American History education in selected public high schools in Iowa. Nearly 64 percent of the responding teachers reported using teaching methods that are eclectic--a mixture of traditional and new social studies approaches. About 32 percent reported using very traditional approaches, and the remaining 4 percent indicated that they use teaching techniques that are highly compatible with new social studies ideals.

The reports on teaching materials followed a somewhat similar pattern. About 66 percent of the teachers surveyed used materials judged to be a combination of traditional and new social studies in orientation. Nearly 35 percent rely on traditional texts and supplementary materials. About 9 percent used new social studies oriented materials.

A majority of the respondents--66 percent--reported that they use interdisciplinary approaches in teaching American History. The remaining 34 percent indicated little or no use of concepts or subject matter material from other social science disciplines.

Teachers reported highly favorable attitudes toward new social studies concepts and practices. About 79 percent of the respondents' scores fell into Category Two favoring an eclectic approach. The remaining 21 percent were in Category Three--favoring new social studies approaches to a high degree.

Analysis of the third question showed a significant relationship between teachers' opinions about new social studies ideals and years of teaching experience. Those with more than seven years experience showed more favorable opinions regarding new social studies ideals than did those with seven or fewer years experience. There were no other statistically significant relationships between the selected variables and the use of new social studies methods, materials, and class organizations or between the variables and teacher opinions.

Analysis of the findings showed that a majority of teachers surveyed favored a middle-of-the-road approach in regard to teaching methods and materials. Nearly two-thirds of the respondents indicated a preference for classroom activities and approaches that stressed a

compromise between traditional narrative history and a completely inductive problem-solving approach. By a similar majority responding teachers reported that they used materials that reflected a combination of traditional and new social studies approaches. Teachers likewise reported favorable attitudes and opinions toward new social studies ideals. Nearly four-fifths of the scores showed a preference for an eclectic approach and the remainder reflected approval of new social studies practices and concepts. Among the teachers surveyed those with more than seven years experience had significantly more favorable attitudes toward new social studies ideals than those with less experience.

Chapter 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study examined particular facets of the present state of American History education in selected public high schools in Iowa. The research centered on aspects of social studies education that are associated with the new social studies movement. Originating in the 1960's, the movement resulted in a renewed emphasis on inductive problem-solving approaches to teaching the content and processes that make up citizenship education. The investigation examined the impact of this movement on the practices presently used by teachers in randomly selected Iowa public high schools. American History teachers were selected for particular attention because the required nature of the classes provided a common basis for study.

The roots of the new social studies movement are as old as Socrates. In the early Twentieth Century John Dewey emphasized a problem-solving inductive approach to education. However, the decade between 1967 and 1977 saw the latest resurgence of stress on an inquiry-based methodology for social studies education. Although the emphasis on inquiry and inductive reasoning were considered quite important, many educators also stressed additional aspects of what is known as the new social studies.

Other elements of curriculum and instruction often accented by new social studies advocates included: (1) the importance of developing an awareness of processes and problem-solving structures based on social science models, (2) the emphasis on conceptual development, (3) the use of interdisciplinary approaches, and (4) the use of multi-material approaches and of materials designed with an inquiry approach in mind.

To determine the acceptance of new social studies concepts and techniques in selected Iowa public high schools a questionnaire-opinionnaire was sent to American History teachers in thirty-five randomly selected representative schools. The respondents answered questions concerning the methods and materials used in their classes and also indicated their attitudes toward various ideas stressed by new social studies advocates.

The questionnaire-opinionnaire was used to provide information to answer the following questions:

1. To what extent are "new social studies" methods, materials, and organizations used by American History teachers in selected public high schools in Iowa?
2. What opinions do teachers of American History in selected public high schools hold toward new social studies techniques and concepts?
3. Is there a relationship between selected variables and the use of new social studies methods,

materials, and organizations, and is there a relationship between the variables and teacher opinions regarding the new social studies methods, materials and organizations?

The variables are:

- (A) years of teacher experience
- (B) number of class preparations
- (C) educational exposure of the teacher to the new social studies--attendance at workshops or classes on the new social studies

CONCLUSIONS

Analysis of the respondents' answers to the questionnaire-opinionnaire resulted in the following conclusions. Twenty-eight teachers--nearly 64 percent--reported using teaching methodologies that reflected a combination of traditional and new social studies approaches. Fourteen respondents, nearly 32 percent, indicated that they taught in a traditional manner. The remaining two, or 4 percent, gave answers that indicated a considerable use of new social studies methodologies.

In the use of teaching materials, twenty-four, or 56 percent, indicated that they used texts and supplementary materials that were judged to be an eclectic combination of traditional and innovative. Fifteen teachers--35 percent--used traditional materials which strongly emphasized a narrative approach. The other four respondents, 9 percent, used materials that were designed to reflect a new social studies orientation.

Twenty-nine respondents, 66 percent, said that they used subject matter materials and concepts from social science disciplines in organizing and presenting the coursework for their American History classes. Fifteen teachers, 34 percent, indicated that they did not.

All respondents reported favorable attitudes toward new social studies ideals. Thirty-four teachers, 79 percent, gave answers that placed them in Category Three--favoring an approach which combines traditional and new social studies methods. The other nine teachers, 21 percent, showed a highly favorable attitude toward new social studies concepts and techniques--Category Three.

Analysis of the teachers' responses showed that there was no statistically significant relationship between any of the three variables--years of teacher experience, number of class preparations, and educational exposure to the new social studies--and the use of new social studies methods, materials, and organizations. Likewise, there was no relationship between teacher opinions and the number of class preparations or exposure to the new social studies.

There was, however, a significant relationship between teacher opinions and years of teacher experience. Examination of the statistics showed that teachers with more than seven years experience expressed more favorable attitudes toward new social studies techniques and

concepts than those with seven or less years experience. The statistics gave no clue as to the reasons for the relationship between the two factors. Several explanations are possible. Experienced teachers, for example, might tend to be more frustrated with the philosophy and assumptions that are associated with a traditional narrative approach to teaching American History. On the other hand, experienced teachers might simply have tended to have a different set of assumptions as to what they "should" think about social studies education and about what ought to be "proper" educational goals and methods. At any rate, there was little evidence to support the idea that the relationship was due to the timing of the teachers' formal education, since no relationship was shown between educational exposure to the new social studies and teachers' opinions.

In addition to the formal outcomes, some further conclusions resulted. Examinations of the questionnaires showed that two companies, Harcourt, Brace Javonovich and Houghton Mifflin, published half of the textbooks used by the responding teachers. Sixteen of the forty-three respondents used Rise of the American Nation, which is published by Harcourt, Brace Javonovich. Generally considered the most popular American History text in Iowa, four editions of the book were used in the various

schools.¹ Six teachers reported using one of two texts published by Houghton Mifflin. This situation would seem to result in these two companies; Harcourt, Brace Javonovich and Houghton Mifflin; having a particularly strong influence on the exposure that students have to the study of American History.

Results of the research show that further conclusions may be drawn concerning the present state of commercially prepared teaching materials for American History classes. Only four of forty-three teachers relied primarily on a textbook or other materials specifically designed for use with an inductive approach to learning. In fact, those publishers that made strong efforts to produce new social studies oriented materials have not found them to be commercially successful. Holt, Rinehart and Winston placed an especially heavy emphasis on development and sale of books and associated materials designed in reaction to and as part of the new social studies movement. Few schools use these materials, and Holt, Rinehart and Winston is in the process of redesigning its approach to American History.

¹Results of the survey showed Rise of the American Nation to be by far the most popular American History text in Iowa high schools. Further evidence of this popularity was shown in a December, 1976 interview with Edward Carmichael. Mr. Carmichael, a social studies consultant and salesman for Holt, Rinehart and Winston, confirmed the book's dominant position.

The new text will have fewer inquiry exercises, place less emphasis on social science concepts, and use a more chronological approach than present materials.¹

In spite of the general commercial failure of materials especially designed for inquiry, the survey of Iowa teachers indicated that a majority of respondents used basic texts and other materials which partially reflected a new social studies orientation. Twenty-eight of forty-three respondents used materials judged to be either in Category Three--using new social studies concepts to a high degree--or in Category Two--using an approach that reflects a mixture of new social studies and traditional methods. Examination of textbooks developed during the late 1960's and early 1970's showed that several publishers tended to change, to some degree, the nature of American History materials that they produced. These changes resulted in an increased emphasis on primary-source materials and interdisciplinary approaches to teaching American History. These publications tended, for example, to place a stronger emphasis on concepts and approaches that are associated with sociology and economics.

¹Edward Carmichael, a salesman and social studies consultant for Holt, Rinehart and Winston, reported this to the writer during an interview on December 9, 1976. Mr. Carmichael was a member of a research and development team which established the basic approach for the new materials.

The data generated by the questionnaire and an examination of materials did not produce any evidence to prove a direct relationship between the new social studies movement and the changes in published teaching materials. However, the strong circumstantial evidence suggested that there is a connection.

The evidence developed from the study suggested other conclusions which may be drawn. Teachers generally showed very favorable attitudes toward new social studies techniques and concepts. Examination of the opinion section of the questionnaire-opinionnaire showed that 79 percent of the respondents fell into Category Two--favoring an eclectic approach. Twenty-one percent were in Category Three which indicated a highly favorable attitude toward the new social studies- The opinion categories were arbitrarily drawn and admittedly less than precise. However, it was clear that teachers expressed very favorable attitudes toward new social studies methodologies and approaches to teaching. Respondents showed particularly strong favor for primary sources and for using an inductive approach in teaching history. Well over half of the teachers said that they favored using a problem-solving methodology, and a strong majority felt that learning how to "think like a historian" is more important than learning factual material. In fact the opinionnaire results showed only two areas where the majority of teachers opposed

ideas which were promoted by new social studies proponents. Most teachers rejected the idea of teaching history from a completely conceptual approach; they also opposed teaching "social studies" as one subject. In general, however, respondents showed very favorable attitudes toward new social studies ideals.

On the other hand, teachers' responses reflected less support of new social studies concepts in their actual teaching methodologies. Fewer than 5 percent of the forty-four respondents' scores fell into Category Three, favoring new social studies approaches; while nearly 32 percent of the scores fell into Category One--traditional. The remaining 64 percent were in Category Two, using an eclectic approach. A strong majority of the teachers said that they lectured "usually" or "often." About half reported using secondary sources--texts and other materials--either "often" or "usually." Neither of these practices is highly compatible with new social studies approaches.

The results seemed to reflect ambivalence on the part of teachers toward new social studies methodologies. On one hand the respondents indicated quite positive attitudes toward concepts, techniques, and ideals which are compatible with the new social studies, and many publishers changed their materials so as to reflect more emphasis on inductive learning, problem solving,

conceptualization and interdisciplinary learning. On the other hand there was less evidence to show that the new social studies concepts and approaches were widely used by American History teachers. In other words, in their opinions teachers supported the new social studies to a considerable extent, but they seemed less willing or able to support the concepts in the classroom.

Several factors or combinations of factors could account for the differences between profession and practice. For example, teachers may have given opinions that they perceived as "correct" rather than express their true attitudes. Or it may be that the respondents sincerely held positive attitudes about the new social studies approaches but did not have the necessary skills, training, or knowledge to put their feelings into action. In this vein Francis P. Hunkins suggested that curriculum devevopers of the 1960's spent too much of their energies on developing materials and too little on developing "procedures for creating curriculum or for introducing curriculum changes in schools." Curriculum planners, he felt, overlooked the "technical aspects of implementation and maintenance."¹ Whatever the reasons, the results of

¹Francis P. Hunkins, "Building Curriculum: Influences and Mechanisms," Perspectives on Curriculum Development 1776-1976, ed. O. L. Davis, Jr. (Washington, D. C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1976), pp. 93-94.

this study tended to support the view that materials and opinions changed more than performance and teaching approaches in the classroom.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The results of this study suggested areas for further investigation. Further examination of the classroom methods used by teachers is desirable. Self reports by teachers have, by their very nature, a higher than desirable chance for exaggeration or misleading results. A researcher with sufficient resources could provide valuable information by first-hand study of social studies teachers in the classroom. The results of such research would generate additional knowledge regarding current teaching practices.

Another area for investigation involves examination of any possible relationship between the teaching approaches used by teachers and the institutions at which they received their training. Such a study might determine if particular colleges and universities tend to educate teachers who are inclined to use traditional or innovative methods in teaching American History or if their graduates hold distinctive attitudes as to the purposes of social studies education.

Replication of this study could also provide a basis for subsequent research. Such an approach would act as a check on trends in social studies education.

The present study could serve as a baseline by which changes would be measured.

Since this study concluded that teachers with over seven years experience tend to express more positive attitudes toward new social studies ideals than those with less experience, future research could be aimed at further examination of this finding. For example, it would be interesting to know why experience is a significant factor in relation to teacher attitudes.

Finally, two findings of this study showed significance at the .10 level, although not so at the .05 level. Further study of the relationship between class organization and educational exposure to the new social studies and the relationship between teaching methods and the number of class preparations could provide useful information.

A decade has passed since the new social studies trend swept across the nation. Many thousands of dollars were spent, millions of words written, and countless man-hours of effort expended to promote an inquiry-based, interdisciplinary, concept-oriented approach to teaching social studies. Experts wrote books and articles. Teachers attended classes and workshops. Publishers produced new materials intended for use with new social studies approaches. Meanwhile, the federal government paid part of the bill.

It appears that intense interest in the new social studies has subsided. Publishers have returned to producing more conventional texts and materials. Professional journals devote little space to discussions of social studies teaching methodologies. In general, the tumult has died.

Yet, the evidence suggests that citizenship education changed as a result of the ferment caused by the new social studies movement. Although no conclusive statement regarding change can be made, because of the limited amount of baseline data about conditions prior to the advent of the movement, it is evident that textbooks and teaching materials place more emphasis on new social studies techniques and ideals than they did ten years ago. Teachers, especially those with more than seven years experience, express very favorable attitudes toward new social studies concepts. Many teachers, in varying degrees, use methods compatible with the innovative ideals favored by new social studies advocates. There is little reason to think that the "revolution" sought by new social studies proponents has occurred, but there is at least circumstantial evidence to support the view that the movement resulted in less spectacular changes in approaches and attitudes.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

- Allen, Rodney F., John V. Fleckenstein, and Peter M. Lyon, eds. Inquiry in the Social Studies. Washington, D. C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1967.
- Ausubel, D. P. The Psychology of Meaningful Verbal Learning. New York: Grune and Stratton, 1963.
- Biehler, Robert F. Psychology Applied to Learning. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1971.
- Bruner, Jerome S. The Process of Education. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960.
- Davis, O. L., Jr., ed. Perspectives on Curriculum Development 1776-1976. Washington, D. C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1976.
- Fair, Jean, and Fannie R. Shaftel, eds. Effective Thinking in the Social Studies. Washington, D. C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1967.
- Feldman, Martin, and Eli Serfman, eds. The Social Studies. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1969.
- Fenton, Edwin. The New Social Studies. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.
- Goldmark, Bernice. Social Studies: a Method of Inquiry. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1968.
- Hebert, Louis J., and William Murphy, eds. Structure in the Social Studies. Washington, D. C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1967.
- Kaplan, Abraham. The Conduct of Inquiry. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1964.

B. PERIODICALS

- Barr, Robert Dale. "The Changing Role of History in American Public Schools," Dissertation Abstracts International, 30 (1970), 4670-4671A (Purdue University).
- Barth, James L., and S. Samuel Shermis. "Defining the Social Studies: An Exploration of Three Traditions," Social Education, 34 (November, 1970), 743-751.
- Branson, Margaret Stimann. "Using Inquiry Methods in the Teaching of American History," Social Education, 35 (November, 1971), 776-782.
- Brubaker, Dale L., Lawrence H. Simon, and Jo Watts Williams. "A Conceptual Framework for Social Studies Curriculum and Instruction," Social Education, 41 (March, 1977), 201-205.
- Cogan, John J. "Social Studies: Past, Present, Future," Educational Leadership, 33 (January, 1976), 293-295.
- Cummings, John Phillip. "An Analysis and Evaluation of Affective Objectives in Recent Social Studies Curriculum Projects for the Senior High School," Dissertation Abstracts International, 31 (1971), 3001A (Auburn University).
- Dante, Harris L. "Social Studies Education: Dilemma, Divisions, and Directions," Social Education, 38 (February, 1974), 187-194.
- Elwell, William C. "Where Are the Inquirers in Social Studies Education?" The Social Studies, 63 (December, 1972), 326-328.
- Eulie, Joseph. "Structure and Strategies in the New Social Studies--An Evaluation," Journal of Secondary Education, 44 (January, 1969), 12-18.
- Fenton, Edwin. "History in the New Social Studies," Social Education, 30 (May, 1966), 325-328.
- Gerlach, Ronald A. "Educational Objectives and the New Social Studies," School and Society, 99 (March, 1971), 180-182.

- Gross, Richard E. "The Status of the Social Studies in the Public Schools of the United States: Facts and Impressions of a National Survey," Social Education, 41 (March, 1977), 194-200.
- Hagen, Owen A., and Steve T. Stansberry. "Why Inquiry," Social Education, 33 (May, 1969), 534-537.
- Harris, Thomas C., and Larry E. Mings. "The Revolution in American History," Curriculum Report (of the National Association of Secondary School Principals), 5 (April, 1976), 1-12.
- Hermann, G. "Learning by Discovery: A Critical Review of Studies," The Journal of Experimental Education, 38 (Fall, 1969), 58-72.
- Kenworthy, Leonard S. "Changing the Social Studies Curriculum: Some Guidelines and a Proposal," Social Education, 32 (May, 1968), 481-486.
- Kimball, Elizabeth G. "A Survey of the Teaching of History and Social Studies in Secondary Schools," School and Society, 98 (April, 1970), 246-249.
- Kohlberg, Lawrence. "Moral Development and the New Social Studies," Social Education, 37 (May, 1973), 368-375.
- Laforse, Martin. "The New Social Studies Mania: Pause for Thought," The Social Studies, 61 (December, 1970), 325-328.
- _____. "Why Inquiry Fails in the Classroom," Social Education, 34 (January, 1970), 66-67 and 81.
- Manson, Gary, and Elmer D. Williams. "Inquiry: Does It Teach How or What to Think?" Social Education, 34 (January, 1970), 78-81.
- Martorella, Peter H. "Classroom Concepts Learning: Issues and Research Perspectives," Social Education, 35 (December, 1971), 888-892.
- Massialas, Byron G. "Inquiry," Today's Education, 48 (May, 1969), 40-42.
- Michelis, John V. "An Inquiry-Conceptual Theory of Social Studies Curriculum Planning," Social Education, 34 (January, 1970), 68-71.

- Morresett, Irving. "Curriculum Information Network Sixth Report: Preferred Approaches to Teaching Social Studies," Social Education, 41 (March, 1978), 206-209.
- Nelson, Jack L. "The Concept Unit in the Social Studies," The Social Studies, 56 (February, 1965), 46-48.
- Newton, Richard F. "What's New About the New Social Studies?" The Social Studies, 63 (April, 1972), 159-162.
- Pearson, Robert. "Beyond the New Social Studies," The Social Studies, 64 (December, 1973), 315-319.
- Sanders, Norris M., and Marlin Tanck. "A Critical Appraisal of Twenty-Six National Social Studies Projects," Social Education, 34 (April, 1970), 383-449.
- Schwab, Joseph J. "The Concept of the Structure of the Discipline," The Educational Record, 43 (July, 1962), 197-205.
- Rogers, Vincent R. "A Macrocosmic Approach to Inquiry," Social Education, 34 (January, 1970), 74-77.
- Turner, Thomas N. "Individualization Through Inquiry," Social Education, 34 (January, 1970), 72-73.
- Walsh, Thomas Michael. "The Relationship Between the Open-Closed Mindedness Systems Within Teachers and the Degree of Their Implementation of an Innovative Curriculum Program," Dissertation Abstracts International, 32 (1972), 4336A (University of Minnesota).
- Wehlage, Gary. "Inquiry and Explanations," The High School Journal, 53 (November, 1969), 87-89.
- _____, Thomas S. Popkewitz, and H. Michael Hartoonian. "Social Inquiry, Schools, and State Assessment," Social Education, 37 (December, 1973), 766-770.
- Weisenburg, L. A. "A Critique of the New Social Studies," The Social Studies, 59 (April, 1968), 166-169.
- Whittlemore, Richard. "By Inquiry Alone?" Social Education, 34 (March, 1970), 280-285.

C. OTHER SOURCES

- Campbell, Vincent, Susan F. Sawyer, and William J. Webster. PLAN Social Studies: The Match Between Long-Range Objectives and the 1970-71 Curriculum. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 045 491, July, 1970.
- Carmichael, Edward. Interview. December, 1976.
- Chambers, David W. Putting Down the Discovery Learning Hypothesis. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 041 325, March, 1970.
- Fenton, Edwin. "Approach to Civic Education" (paper presented to an Individually Guided Education workshop, Columbia, Missouri, June, 1975).
- Lahnston, Anton T. A Comparison of Directed Discovery and Demonstration Strategies for Teaching Geographic Concepts and Generalizations. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 090 095, February, 1973.
- Ortgiesen, Leroy. A Position on K-12 Social Studies for Nebraska Schools. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 039 152, 1968.
- Tinsley, Drew C., Elizabeth P. Watson, and Jon C. Marshall. Cognitive Objectives Revealed by Classroom Questions in "Process Oriented" and "Content Oriented" Secondary Social Studies Programs. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 040 895, March, 1970.
- Trezise, Robert, ed. Social Studies in Michigan. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 051 067, 1971.

APPENDIX A.

LETTERS TO PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS

The original contact was made through the principal in each of the selected high schools. Following is a copy of that letter.

2620 Marywood Drive
 Dubuque, Iowa 52001
 (Date listed)

Inside address

Dear Mr. (Principal's name):

I am presently working on a dissertation in the field of social studies education as part of the requirements for an Ed.D. degree at Drake University. In order to complete this work I need data concerning teaching materials and methods currently being used by American History teachers in Iowa high schools. I am also interested in teacher opinions regarding these materials and methods.

(Name of school) High School is one of thirty-five randomly selected schools in a representative sample. It would be of great assistance to me if you would ask the American History teachers on your staff to complete and return the enclosed forms. Also enclosed are stamped self-addressed envelopes in which to return the forms. Upon completion of the research a summary of the results will be sent to you.

Your cooperation is very much appreciated.

Sincerely,

Stuart Bintner

The following letter was sent as a follow-up notice to principals in schools that were slow in responding.

2620 Marywood Drive
 Dubuque, Iowa 52001
 (Date listed)

Inside address

Dear Mr. (Principal's name):

A few weeks ago I sent a questionnaire regarding social studies education and asked if you would have the American History teachers on your staff complete it. As of today I have not received a reply from (name of school) High School.

Since I am using a relatively small sample, it is important that I try to obtain a reply from each school. I would very much appreciate your asking the American History teacher(s) on your staff to complete and return the enclosed form. Also included is a stamped self-addressed envelope in which to return the forms. I hope that this does not inconvenience your staff.

Your cooperation is very much appreciated.

Sincerely,

Stuart Bintner

If the second letter did not result in a reply, a third letter was sent to the school. It was addressed to: "American History teacher(s)" and used the same wording as the first letter.

APPENDIX B:

LIST OF SCHOOLS AND THE NUMBER OF REPLIES FROM EACH

Schools with 600 or more students:

Ames	4
Des Moines North	2
Spencer	1
Sioux City West	3

Schools with from 300 to 599 students:

Comanche	1
Maquoketa	1
Maquoketa Valley-Delhi	1
Marion	3
St. Ansgar	1

Schools with 299 and fewer students:

Andrew	1
Avoha--Avoca	1
Burt	1
Cascade	1
Central--Elkader	1
Columbus	1
Corwith-Wesley--Wesley	1
Galva	1
Gilbert	1
Green Mountain	1
Holstein	1
Lakota	1
Lawton	2
Lohrville	1
Manson	1
Paullina	1
Riceville	1
Sanborn	1
Sibley	1
Sioux Rapids	1
Stanton	1
Titonka	1
Wapsie Valley--Fairbank	2
West Liberty	1
Westside--Lake City	1

Total	44
-------	----

Schaller	no return
----------	-----------

APPENDIX C:
QUESTIONNAIRE-OPINIONNAIRE

Teacher Questionnaire -Opinionnaire

1. How many students are enrolled in your school? _____
2. Which grades are included in the above number? _____
3. Do you use a basic text in your American History Course? ____yes ____no
If you answered "yes" to question #3, please answer question #4. If you answered "no", please move on to question #7.
4. Which basic text do you use? Title: _____
Publisher: _____ date: _____
5. Do you use any published materials other than a basic text? ____yes ____no
If yes, please give some representative examples:
a. Title: _____ Publisher: _____ date: _____
b. Title: _____ Publisher: _____ date: _____
6. Do you use teacher-made (or edited) readings or other materials? ____yes ____no
If "yes", please briefly describe a typical example that you have found successful: _____
7. Do you plan to make any changes in basic text or materials in the near future? ____yes ____no If "yes", why are you changing? What do you plan on using? _____
8. In your class do you use interdisciplinary methods and/or materials that draw on other social science fields such as anthropology, sociology, or political science? ____yes ____no If "yes", please list and give some examples. _____
9. For how many years have you been teaching? _____
10. Have you ever attended a class or workshop on "new social studies" techniques and ideas or on teaching by the inquiry method? ____yes ____no If "yes", please give a brief description of the class or workshop. Please include information on when and where you attend it. _____
What other subjects do you teach? _____

Teacher Questionnaire-Opinionnaire

page 2

11. Listed below are several approaches to teaching. Please check (X) in the appropriate place as to how often you use each of the approaches.

	Usually	Often	Occasion- ally	Seldom
1. Lecture				
2. Reading from text or other secondary sources *				
3. Simulation activities				
4. Group discussion **				
5. Working with in- dividual students				

*This refers to conventional narrative texts or supplementary materials. It does not include primary-source readings or documents.

** This includes discussions between the teacher and students and between students and other students. Please do not include time spent clarifying a lecture statement or answering factual questions from assigned readings.

Please check the following statement with one of these responses:
SA=strongly agree A=agree D=disagree SD=strongly disagree

	SA	A	D	SD
1. It is more important for a student to learn to think like an historian than to learn factual material about a historical period.				
2. Primary sources should be used more often than secondary sources.				
3. Using more than one source for materials tends to confuse students and upset the learning process.				
4. It would be a mistake to encourage students to question their own values--or those long accepted by society.				
5. Students learn best when the teacher carefully guides them so as to avoid confusing interpretations.				
6. History is best taught in terms of historical periods (e.g. The Progressive Era) rather than broken down into conceptual areas--e.g. "Reform."				
7. It would be a mistake to teach "social studies" as one discipline at the high school level; it is better to have separate subjects.				
8. Teachers should devote classroom time to teaching students how to think like historians and use the "historical method."				
9. Primary sources tend to be dull and should not be used.				
10. Even though it takes more time, it is better for students to inductively arrive at a conclusion after examining data than to have the teacher tell them the answer.				

Thank you for your cooperation. You may return the questionnaire-opinionnaire in the enclosed envelope.

APPENDIX D:
TEXTBOOKS USED BY RESPONDENTS

<u>Title of Text</u>	<u>Number of Respondents Using</u>	<u>Publisher</u>
<u>Rise of the American Nation</u>	16	Harcourt, Brace, Janonovich
<u>History of the United States</u>	5	Houghton Mifflin
<u>United States History for High Schools</u>	3	Laidlaw Brothers
<u>A People and a Nation</u>	3	Harper and Row
<u>The Shaping of America</u>	2	Holt, Rinehart, and Winston
<u>The United States Since 1865</u>	2	Ginn and Company
<u>Consumer Economic Problems</u>	1	Southwestern Publishing Company
<u>Search for Identity</u>	1	Lippencott
<u>United States History</u>	1	Scott Foresman
<u>The Free and the Brave</u>	1	Rand McNally
<u>The History of a Free People</u>	1	Macmillan
<u>Our American Nation</u>	1	unknown
<u>A New History of the United States</u>	1	Holt, Rinehart, and Winston
<u>The Age of Greatness</u>	1	Globe Book Company
<u>The Making of Modern America</u>	1	Houghton Mifflin
Public Issues Series (Harvard Series)	1	Xerox
<u>Discovering American History</u>	1	Holt, Rinehart, and Winston
<u>A History of the United States</u>	1	Follette